

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY—1906.

I.

THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS.

PROF. A. C. M^CGIFFERT, D.D.

MATT. 26: 64 and 16: 27, "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power and coming on the clouds of heaven." "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works."

The occasion which calls us together this evening is one of peculiar interest and significance. It marks the close of their course of preparation for a number of young men, and fore-shadows their speedy entrance upon the practical work of the Christian ministry, to which they have dedicated their lives. The Christian ministry is a ministry to which they have been called by Jesus Christ, and so it has seemed to me appropriate to the occasion to take as the theme of my discourse the Lordship of Jesus, whose they are and whom they serve.

The Lordship of Jesus finds very frequent expression in our New Testament and other early Christian writings. Thus, for instance, in Mark 16: 19, "After the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God." In Acts 7: 54, "But Stephen, being full of the Holy Ghost looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand

of God." In the two passages quoted as our text, where the session at God's right hand and the return for judgment are associated, and in Matt. 25: 31 where it is said "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory and before Him shall be gathered all the nations, and He shall separate them one from another as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats." And in our Apostles' Creed we have all the three particulars referred to in these passages, ascension, session at God's right hand and judgment, associated together in the familiar words "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

But what do we mean when we use these words to-day? It is clear that the figures contained in the passages quoted are out of date. For the Copernican astronomy has made it impossible for us to think of heaven as a place above our heads, to which Christ ascended and whence he will come down, and our modern way of looking at things is out of line with the naïve anthropomorphism of the fathers, who pictured Christ as actually seated on a throne at God's right hand. But the antiquated nature of the figures should not blind us to the essential character of the truth expressed by them, a truth which is still valid and still of significance. Never more significant indeed than to-day. It is not my purpose to try to set forth all that may be meant by the Lordship of Jesus, all that may be involved in the belief of the early Christians and of the church during the ages since, when they have called him Lord. I want to ask simply what elements of this great truth are of most importance to-day.

I. I should say first of all that an essential element in the Lordship of Jesus is the fact that the purposes of Jesus are the purposes of God, the ruler of this world. This is a fundamental Christian truth. "I came not to do mine own will," Jesus said, "but the will of Him that sent me." And from the beginning to the end of His career it was the work of God

He believed himself to be doing and the purposes of God He believed himself to be fulfilling. The truth is wrapped up, indeed, in His recognition of God as His Father, which underlay all he said and did and suffered. Had his ideals and purposes been other than the ideals and purposes of God as He understood them, He could not have thought of himself as God's son and of God as His Father. And so there should be no question about it. The Christian God, the God whom Christians worship, whatever may be true of the rest of the world, is a God who is controlled by the same great purposes which controlled Jesus, is, in fact, the same kind of a God that Jesus was a man. And so, if we would know Him, we must study, not nature, not history, not our own hearts, but Jesus Christ. The Christlikeness of God—it is the one great truth about God for which the Christian revelation stands. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," Jesus said, and these words are a significant commentary upon many and various doctrines of God, which have emerged in the history of Christian theology, doctrines taken from a study of nature or of man, from science or philosophy, from human experience or fancy, from the Old Testament or the New, from every other source than from the revelation of Jesus Christ himself. God has been represented by Christian theologians, ancient and modern, as the omnipotent maker and ruler of heaven and earth; as the philosophical absolute, illimitable and indefinable; as at once infinite substance and almighty will; as the great All, in communion with whom we lose our petty individuality and become one with the vast universe of being; as the Holy One, into whose presence no sinner may enter; as the great avenger, who allows no transgression to go unpunished unless it has been duly atoned for; as the supreme sovereign of the universe who for the display of His glorious attributes of justice and mercy chooses some men to everlasting salvation and others to everlasting punishment; as one substance in three persons; as "a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in His being wisdom, power, holiness, justice, good-

ness and truth." These and many other things Christian theologians have said about God, but seldom enough have they said the one Christian thing about Him, that He is like Jesus Christ, that if we wish to know Him, we must study Christ, that only by looking upon the life and character of Jesus can we discover what the Christian God, our God, is. For I would have you notice that it is not simply that Jesus' revelation of God is normative, it is final and complete. Not simply that we are to refrain from attributing to God a character out of line with that revealed by Jesus, but that all we know about God we find in Jesus, who was the complete revelation of God to the world and "in whom dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

The character and purposes of Jesus of Nazareth are, I say, the character and purposes of God. This is the true Christian position, and in it is wrapped up the Christian's challenge to the world. The God whom we believe in, we may say to the world, is the Father of Jesus Christ, and is controlled by the same purposes which controlled the life of Jesus his Son. If there be a higher God, show him to us and we will turn from the God and Father of Jesus to worship your God. We will bow before him in adoration and he shall be our God and we his servants. But if there be not, if the Father of Jesus Christ be the highest God we know or can conceive, then let Him be your God as He is ours, and let all of us give ourselves, as Jesus did, to the accomplishment of His purposes and the fulfilling of His will. We could not really remain Christians if we took any other position than this. If we believed that there is a higher God than Jesus' God, that the purposes which actuated Him are not the purposes which actuate the supreme God, we could not continue to worship the Christian God and we could not be content to wear the name of Christ, who was leading us to someone other and lower than the true God. And therefore, I say, in asserting that the purposes of God are the purposes which controlled the life of Jesus we are asserting a funda-

mental truth of our Christian faith, a truth which, if we did not believe, we could not, and would not wish to remain Christians. And so if we would know the purposes, above all the supreme purpose of God, we may discover it by looking upon Jesus and learning the supreme purpose which he undertook to accomplish, the purpose to which above all else He devoted his life. And that purpose it is not difficult to discover. Modern critical study of the New Testament has only made it the more evident, so that to-day the real meaning of Jesus' life stands out with a clearness which it never had in other ages. He came to promote the Kingdom of God, a kingdom in which men should give themselves to the doing of the will of God, their father, in the service of men, their brothers. Whatever God's relation to the physical universe may be, whatever His cosmical activities, whether He is or is not in all the forces of nature, and whether it is He that speaks in the orderly processes as in the great crises and convulsions of the world, is neither here nor there, is in fact of no direct importance to us. A man may believe in the immanence or in the transcendence of God, he may be a monist, or a dualist, or a pluralist,—all this is immaterial from the Christian point of view and comports equally well with Christianity. The one thing of practical importance for us to know about God is the purpose which He is seeking to accomplish in and through us and other men our fellows, that we may get into line with that purpose and give ourselves to its accomplishment even as Jesus did. To get into line with God's purpose is to be at one with the highest forces in the universe and is to succeed as one can in no other way, is to win a victory over all that would oppose and drag us down, over all the hostile forces of the world, even as Jesus won his victory. For though in all that ordinarily goes to make success, the life of Jesus was a failure, though He suffered poverty, shame, a criminal's death, the world to-day stamps His seeming failure as a real success, and recognizes His life and His death in the service of the cause for which He stood as the greatest victory history has to show.

Others have lived nobly and have died bravely, but it is the life and death of Jesus that have won the world. And that because the purpose for which He lived and died is the highest purpose which we can conceive, to build God's kingdom in this world of ours; not to exploit the world, and to win from it glory, wealth and power, but to promote the reign of righteousness and love, to set forces in motion which have made not for the mere well-being of Himself and of His friends and followers, but for the true and permanent betterment of the world. For He came not to save men out of the world, not to establish a church merely, but to save the world itself, to make it the kingdom of His God and Father. In the divineness of His purpose we recognize the Lordship of Jesus. He it is indeed that sitteth at the right hand of God, for His purposes are the purposes of God himself.

II. But, again, when we assert our faith in the Lordship of Jesus, we declare that His moral standards and principles are the highest known to us, and that we believe they are the moral standards and principles of God himself. What is the greatest of the virtues? One man says truthfulness, another honesty, another justice, another patience, another purity, another humility. Men have given all sorts of answers to the question and Jesus too gave his answer. Not purity, not honesty, not justice, good as these are, but love, the spirit and the purpose of brotherliness. All else Jesus subordinated to this one supreme thing. Not the publican, not even the woman taken in sin was condemned by Him, but the righteous Pharisee, who did his complete duty according to the law, but looked upon his fellows with scornful indifference. And not the holy priest or Levite, but the heretical Samaritan, the outsider, was the hero of His greatest parable. This was Jesus' ethical message to the world: "Ye are all brethren," "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so to them." Entering through the knowledge of our own needs and aspirations into an appreciation of the needs and aspirations of our fellows, by

means of that sympathy which true kinship breeds, we are to spend ourselves and all that God has given us that their needs may be met and their aspirations realized. And when we declare our belief in the Lordship of Jesus we virtually declare our faith that this moral standard of His is the highest standard in the world.

But do we really believe it? Certainly it has not always been believed by Christians. Soon after the days of Christ his followers, over against the corruption of the age, began to emphasize above all else personal holiness, and as time passed the more earnest spirits, finding it difficult to realize their ideal in the midst of the temptations and distractions of the world, went into the wilderness, or into the monastery, there to attain a Christian perfection which they could not among their fellows. The ideal thus expressed finally crowded out completely the ideal of Jesus, and the most noble and consistent Christians were believed to be these monks who sacrificed so much for religion's sake, the fact being overlooked that they sacrificed for religion's sake even the principles of Christ himself, whom they professed to follow and to serve. And the same ideal of personal holiness, with a view to personal salvation, has very largely controlled the thinking and the living of the Protestant Church as well. For though we have not had our monasteries, we have had our ideal of consistent Christian living as meaning the cultivation of our own spirituality, and with that in view, the avoiding of such and such associations, or the eschewing of such and such employments. And we have perhaps become Christians ourselves, or have summoned others to become Christians, in order that we and they may be saved, instead of seeing that the only truly Christian reason for being a Christian is that we may follow Christ in His life of service of His fellows.

And yet though Christians have made this great mistake far too often in the past, and perhaps we have sometimes made it ourselves, we realize to-day clearly enough that it is a mistake. As we look upon Christ we see what the Christian life truly is,

and more than that, we believe that such a life is the highest life in all the world. If we did not, if, on the contrary, we believed that there is something nobler than following Jesus in his life of self-forgetful service, if we believed that His summons to such a life as He lived is a summons to something lower than the highest, that for men to live with one another in the spirit of true brotherly kindness and helpfulness is not the best way to live, then we certainly should not think of calling ourselves Christians, but we should seek our leader elsewhere, a leader who might show us a loftier and more divine way. By the very fact that we call ourselves Christians, we declare that Jesus' moral standards and ideals are the highest known to us and that they appeal to the very best that is in us. We may think what we please about the physical power of Christ and about His cosmical activities, we may think of Him as working together with God in all the processes of nature, as holding the planets in their orbits and presiding over the succession of the seasons, we may mean all this if we please, when we speak of Him as exalted to the right hand of God, but it is entirely immaterial. We may believe it or not, without in any way affecting our Christian faith and life, and it is not for such beliefs as this that we stand to-day. Whatever may have been the case in other days, to-day when we assert the Lordship of Jesus, the only thing in the assertion that is of any consequence is that His purposes, His principles and His ideals are in control, that they represent the highest that the world knows. This we believe, and this we stand for, and for this reason we labor to make Jesus' purposes and ideals ever more widely regnant. We believe that society would be morally perfect if his principle of brotherly love controlled absolutely and everywhere all the relations of men with men. We recognize in Jesus' moral principles, ideal principles fitted for the life of man everywhere and always, and so we declare our belief in the Lordship of Jesus, in his exaltation to the right hand of God His Father.

And not simply do we recognize Jesus' principles as of ideal worth and so fitted to control the world, and not simply do we consecrate ourselves as Christians to the promotion of His principles that they may become ever more widely regnant, but we actually recognize that they are more and more dominating the world, and so our creed is not merely a declaration of what we believe ought to be but of what actually is in ever-increasing measure. For as we look into the world about us and then back into the centuries that are gone, we discover that to-day the thoughts and the lives of men are controlled by the principles of Jesus to a degree true in no other age. Whether the world is growing better or worse is a question often disputed. And whether there is more or less vice and intemperance, lying and stealing, Sabbath breaking and indifference to various religious ordinances, than there once was, may perhaps fairly be debated. But about one thing there can be no possible dispute, the age in which we live is witnessing a more widespread emphasis both within and without Christian circles upon Jesus' great principle of the brotherhood of man, and a more complete realization of it in active helpful service than any age before. And this is after all the great test. Recognizing as we do to-day that in the spirit and purpose of true brotherliness is to be found the highest expression of man's moral nature, we can hardly fail to see that the world is on a higher level than ever before. And unless we shall repudiate our belief in the supremacy of Jesus' ethical principles we cannot doubt that in the end this fuller realization in the world's life of his spirit will bring with it an improved moral tone in all respects. For he who fully enters into Jesus' purpose of service cannot permanently be content with the mere physical betterment of those for whom he labors, he must strive also for their moral uplifting, and for their sakes and not his own alone he must keep himself pure and upright as he tries to make them. And thus in the spirit of Christ which is laying hold so mightily to-day upon those without as well as those within the church, we may see a power for the moral uplifting

of the world more far-reaching and more efficacious than any other ever known. And all this we may give expression to when we declare our belief in the Lordship of Jesus. His is indeed the Kingdom, for His principles are taking increasing possession of this world, the world of His Father God.

III. Finally, the belief in the Lordship of Jesus involves the belief that He is judge, a belief that is expressed in the second of the passages quoted as our text, as also in the Apostles' Creed, which declares in accordance with New Testament teaching, that "He shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

But is not Jesus above all a being of love and mercy, and shall we think of him as judging and condemning anyone? Yes, Jesus is love and mercy and so is God, his Father. And we may be sure that every man whom God can save he saves, even as Jesus did all he could for every needy person within his reach. But not even Jesus, and not even God, his Father, can save all. It is not necessary for God to condemn the wicked, the wicked condemn themselves; and they pass judgment upon themselves every time they sin; yes, every time they fall short of the best of which they are capable. Let us not be misled by the imagery of our text. Let us not push the judgment far off into the future, and suppose it means only that at the end of the world the books will be opened and they that have done well will be received into eternal felicity and they that have done ill will be condemned to eternal punishment. The judgment is going on all the time, a judgment passed upon men not by Jesus, or by anyone else, but by themselves, as they fall below their own highest ideals of what they ought to be. And in the future they will not need Christ or anyone else to judge them, as they see in the light of the experience of their whole life how far short they have fallen of the man they might have been. What they will need then, as now, is not a judge but a Saviour, if haply they may be saved. And our text means to-day, and our creed as well, whatever they may have meant in other days of a more crude religious faith,

simply that judgment is passed upon men in accordance with the ideals and principles of Jesus. In this sense He is judge as He is Lord. Not are they good or bad, according to the ordinary standards of men the world over, but what are they according to the standard of Jesus, which transcends all others and is the highest that the world has known? Are they living with their fellows in the true spirit of brotherliness, the spirit of Christ? Are they serving to the best of their ability? Are they doing all they can to promote God's good purposes of love for the world? Are they using all their gifts and all their attainments not to promote their own prosperity but to help and bless the world? If not, of what good are they? Were they created for their own sake alone and can they live unto themselves alone? They may, if they will, but this universe in which we all live, run through and through as it is by the good purposes of God, the Father of Jesus, what place is there in it for one who lives only for himself? And when men come to a full realization of the meaning of it all, how the principle of service is writ large upon it from the highest to the lowest, from God himself to the meanest of His creatures, theirs it will be to pass judgment upon themselves. If they cannot be a part of it, if they cannot come into oneness with God's great and all controlling purpose, even when they see it in all its beauty and glory, if they cannot even then live with their fellows in the true spirit of brotherhood, and with their God in the true spirit of sonship, they will be glad enough to flee into the outer darkness.

"The Kingdom of this world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come ye blessed of my Father inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me, I was sick and ye visited me, I was in prison and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him saying, Lord when saw we thee an hungered and

fed thee, or thirsty and gave thee drink ? When saw we thee a stranger and took thee in ? Or naked and clothed thee ? Or when saw we thee sick or in prison and came unto thee ? And the king shall answer and say unto them, verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK CITY.

II.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH OF HUNGARY.

BY FRANCIS BALOGH,

PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT
DEBRECZEN, HUNGARY. CONDENSED TRANSLATION BY THE
REV. LOUIS NANASSY.

§ 1. *The Division of the History of the Hungarian Reformed Church.*

This history is to be divided into two parts:

- (a) The reception and victory of the Reformation from the beginning until the fall of the dynasty of Prince Rákóczi (1517-1660).
- (b) The suffering state of the Church and the gradual release of the same from the fall of the dynasty of Rákóczi until the present time (1660-1906).

PART FIRST.

I. THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION.

§ 2. *The First (Lutheran) Traces of the Reformation at Buda; the First Measures Against It.*

The ninety-five Theses of Luther caused an echo at Buda, capital of Hungary. Margrave Brandenburg, the uncle and military instructor of King Louis II., showed sympathy with the new ideas; in like manner the German lords, belonging to the royal court, among whom was Pempflinger, with his daughter Catharine, courtlady to the queen. Even Mary, the young queen, looked on with favor, when Luther arose against the abuses, and she winked at the scourging of the pope and cardinals by her preacher, Cordatus. But when he was accused by

the internuncio, the queen was compelled to dismiss him from office. Cordatus then went to Luther and from Wittenberg sent John, his commissioner, to Hungary in order to spread the writings of Luther. The Hungarians captured and burned him at the stake, together with his books.

In spite of this dreadful event Cordatus returned to Buda in 1525, having confidence in the protection of the royal court, and with Kreislenger, priest of Buda, began openly to proclaim the Gospel. But both were captured and lodged in jail. Although through the influence of the court Cordatus was set at liberty, he had to leave Hungary forever.

Henkel, the learned court-preacher, who was called to fill the place of Cordatus, also sympathized with the Reformation, but sowed the seeds of the Gospel more cautiously than his predecessor. He accompanied the queen to the imperial Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, and there preached the spirit of the Gospel. But Mary, by the request of Charles V., her uncle, had to discharge her favorite priest. Ferdinand, her other uncle, also endeavored to draw her away from the Reformation. But the queen in her soul remained faithful to Luther, who being informed of her attachment to the Reformation, forwarded to her the translation of four psalms and a song in order to console her, after the fatal fall of her husband, Louis II.

Under the influence of Queen Mary and Margrave Brandenburg the Reformation spread rapidly among the burghers of Buda. The council of the city, as early as 1552, called *Speratus* to be minister. He had been driven out of Vienna on account of his evangelical teachings. In the high schools scholars brought from abroad—like Grynæus, a friend of Melanchthon and Windschemius—taught the principles of the Reformation to the youth.

It was but natural that the heads of the Roman clergy arose immediately and most vehemently against the Reformation, which menaced their church to its foundation. They even aroused the nobility, representing the bulk of the nation, headed by *Verböczi*, the famous lawyer and supreme royal judge. He

objected on grounds of patriotism to the Reformation of German origin, and set himself against the German courtiers espousing it. As the delegate of the king he was present at the noted Diet of Worms (1521). He invited Luther to his table and disputed ardently with him. He printed Monk Ambroise's work written against the doctrines of Luther. He wrote the preface to the same, in which he called upon Louis II., as fitting a valorous king, to exterminate the "Lutheran contagion" from his dominion. The Diet of Buda in 1523, being under the influence of Verböczi and Szapolyai, made a law that the king as Catholic sovereign should punish all Lutherans, their patrons and adherents, with decapitation and confiscation. To the councils of the cities of Sopron and Bartfa an ordinance was sent forbidding under penalty the reading of the books of Luther. Royal commissioners gathered and burned the writings of Luther at Sopron. In consequence of the resolution of Buda, *Grynaeus* and *Windschemius* were driven away from their chairs and became the ornaments of schools in other lands (*Grynaeus* at Basle, *Windschemius* at Wittenberg).

The rage against the Reformation reached its highest point at the riotous Diet of Rakos in 1525, the leader here being Verböczi, the elected palatine. The fourth article passed here ordered that every Lutheran be driven out of the country and if any were found at any place, they might be captured and burned not only by ecclesiastical, but also by laical persons. For this law Pope Clement VII. honored the palatine with a congratulatory letter. In consequence of the law passed at Rakos the council of Buda burned one and Verböczi burned eight Lutherans.

On account of these severe ordinances and cruel proceedings the Reformation was indeed suppressed in the capital of Hungary. In the beginning of the Turkish dominion the first Protestant congregation and school were organized at Buda and they existed till the recapture of the city (1686). With the restitution of Christian supremacy they ceased again. Its

church building, which had been laid in ruins under the siege, was surrendered to the monks by King Leopold. The Reformed Church was not reorganized at the capital until 1796.

§ 3. *The Extension of the Reformation from 1526 till 1541.*

After the battle of Mohacs, in 1526, the nation could not agree as to the election of the new king and the country was divided into two parts. Two kings were elected—the national party elected John Szapolyai and the Hapsburg party Ferdinand. Civil war broke out between the two parties and kings, and amid the continual contest and struggle the Reformation extended rapidly, because without outward oppression and violence the people could freely receive the long expected truth of the Gospel.

At first both kings issued severe ordinances against the Reformation. King John menaced the Lutherans with confiscation. In consequence of his orders pastor *Nikolai* and teacher *Gregori* suffered martyrdom at the stake for their faith (1527).

The ordinances of King Ferdinand sounded more strongly; the monks leaving the cloisters and taking wife were to be put in jail; those who rejected the veneration of Mary the Virgin to be sentenced to death, as well as the ministers who administered the communion in both kinds; the building, in which it happened was to be razed. But when both kings perceived that the Reformation was spreading without stoppage, as it were the morning light, and that those nobles whom they sorely needed to strengthen their royal power were becoming converts to the purified religion: both failed to set themselves energetically against the Reformation or to enforce the ordinances. The kings were compelled to be patient and tolerant, and so the magnates, nobles, cities and common people turned over in crowds to the Protestant faith.

In the territory under Turkish dominion the individual was allowed to follow his religious conviction. Even the Turks were more favorable to the puritan Protestantism than to the

Roman Catholics, whom they were inclined to class as idolaters on account of their attitude as to the pictures and saints.

It was of great importance to the quick expansion of the Reformation that, especially after 1530, the Hungarian youth—even older men too—turned in great numbers to the university of Wittenberg, where by immediate contact with the Reformers they received a new spirit and view of the world and became in Hungary the bold preachers of the same. From 1552 till 1560 the number of Hungarian students who heard the words of the Gospel at Wittenberg amounted to nearly fifteen hundred. Armed with science and faith, aglow with apostolic enthusiasm, with courage to endure as martyrs, these, teaching in the national language, became the greatest of the Hungarian reformers and conquered the hearts of the lower and the upper classes for the Reformation.

§ 4. The First Patrons and Proclaimers of the Reformation.

The first patrons and proclaimers of the Reformation appeared after the battle of Mohacs, the period being favorable for the Reformation. At first only indulgence and good will were shown toward the purified faith. We know only of Margrave *Brandenburg* as openly Lutheran. He organized an evangelical church at Simand.

Thurzó, the state-treasurer, later supreme judge, in his testament, laid a foundation for the Lutheran congregation of Lőcse, as well as for the support of those young men going to the University of Wittenberg. *Perényi*, the powerful lord of Sárospatak, directly asked the king not to disturb him as a good Christian. Under his protection the Gospel was proclaimed by *Siklósi*. At the same time the other enthusiastic soldier of the Reformation, *Kopácsi*, a Franciscan prior, came upon the scene and reformed the dominion of *Perényi*. This lord established a school at Sárospatak (1531), of which the first professor was *Kopácsi*. *Gálszécsi*, reformer at Gyula, wrote the first hymnal (1536), and edited a catechism at Cra-

cow (1538). His pupil was *Patizi*, whom Melanchthon recommended to the protection of John *Perényi*, lord-lieutenant of Ugocea. He was an excellent author of songs and books. *Ozorai*, working in the county of Békés, in his work on "Christ and the Antichrist" (1535), was the first to throw light in a literary way on the mind as to the essential differences existing between the Roman and the Protestant churches.

Beyond the Danube, *Nádasdy*, the palatine of the country, was the most zealous and influential patron of the Reformation. He was the favorite counselor of King Ferdinand and his delegate to the imperial Diet of Speier (1529). He established a school at Ujsriget, for which Melanchthon honored him with a laudatory letter.

To this school of Nadasdi was called Erdösi. This man of evangelical spirit and great learning was the first to translate the New Testament into Hungarian. His science was so well reputed that he was appointed professor of the Hebrew language at the university of Vienna.

Eszéki, the founder of the school at Tolna, sowed the seeds of the Reformation beyond the Danube. He was accused before the pasha of Buda, but, after having been well informed, the pasha issued the famous order that the ministers be allowed to preach the evangelical faith everywhere and to everybody.

In the upper territory of Hungary, where the German language was spoken, *Lovcsányi*, *Quendel* and *Fischer* spread the Reformation. The reformers of Transylvania were *Heltai* among the Hungarians and *Hontor* among the Saxons. The latter was called for his merits to be the Evangelist to Transylvania.

In the country of King John, toward the end of his life, the Reformation spread further and further. He was compelled himself, when the pope did not support, but even excommunicated him on account of his alliance with the Turks, and when he was suspected with heresy, to take the longest step toward the Reformation. The king himself provided a way of escape

for *Szegedi*, who was about to be dragged to the pile by Bishop Frater, because at the first dispute held at Segesvár (1538), he had asserted that the mass and the administration of the communion in one kind are contrary to the Gospel.

§ 5. *The Reformatory Career of Matthias Biró of Deva.*

After the battle of Mohács a favorable turn for the Protestant cause was marked by the appearance of *Biró*, who was the first Hungarian reformer with a general purpose. He was born at Déva and studied at Cracow. On his return he became monk. But the mechanical ceremonies did not answer the world of his thought and feeling. Moved by the free spirit, he took off his monastic gown and betook himself to the University of Wittenberg in 1529. There he drank in the words of Luther and Melanchthon, boasted of their confidence, and imbibed the doctrines of the Reformation. Returning to Hungary he devoted his life to the cause of the Reformation and, like St. Paul, was willing to do and suffer everything for the Gospel of Christ.

At first he labored at Buda and in its vicinity. He summed up the evangelical doctrine in fifty-two articles, and though these were read in manuscript only, they had great influence in illuminating men's minds. His other pamphlet, by which the Reformation was introduced, was on "The Sleep of the Saints."

For his teaching King John captured the bold preacher and put him in jail. But after having fortunately escaped, he fled to Kassa, where the people welcomed him. Here too persecution awaited him. The suffragan-bishop of Eger sent his beadle by night and dragged him under escort to Vienna in 1531. In vain the council of Kassa petitioned in his interest. Bishop Faber, of Vienna, put him in fetters and set him before an inquisitory court. Several times he was summoned from prison and teased and terrified in order to lead him from his conviction; but he scientifically defended his standpoint and as a Hungarian citizen objected to the foreign

and partial judges. Once Faber let him depart to his prison with these words: "I would bless thee if thou wert a Christian." Biró replied: "I do not want thy blessing: God blesses me." Finally by the intercession of the people of Kassa, he was released from the prison and went to the court of Lord Nádasdy, in Sárvár (1533).

In this quiet refuge Biró composed his reply to Szegedy, monk of Nagyvárad, who, commissioned by Bishop Faber, undertook to refute the theses of Biró and prepared an apology for the veneration of the saints. Biró printed his work at Cracow in 1537. But previously, in order to cure a disease of his eyes and stomach, with the aid of Nádasdy he went to Nürnberg, where he spent the winter with a fellow-minister, whose friendship he had formed at Wittenberg. By request he wrote the story of his imprisonment at Vienna, and in order to make it understood to foreigners he prepared in Latin his reply to Szegedi. It was translated later into German. From Nürnberg he visited Wittenberg a second time, and thence took along a letter of Melanchthon addressed to Nádasdy, in which Melanchthon most warmly recommended him.

After his return to Hungary, because the bishop of Eger intended to arrest him he fled abroad to Melanchthon. He, wishing to help the persecuted Hungarian reformer, commended him to Margrave Brandenburg, who lived at that time near to Nürnberg. Not until 1543 could he return to Hungary. He received ministerial office at Miskolcz but before the rage of the monks had to flee, and Dragfi took him under his protection, beyond the Theis. Not long afterwards (1545), Biró completed the course of life, which in his case was full of adversities, but crowned with signal success. It is not known with certainty where he died and where rest the ashes of the great reformer.

§ 6. *The Conditions from 1540 till 1555.*

In the territory of King Ferdinand the hierarchy arose more strongly against the Reformation and demanded legal

measures. Several fanatic lords, growing bold, wreaked their anger in horrible manner upon the proclaimers of the Gospel. For instance, Lord-lieutenant Bebek pursued *Fischer*, the reformer of Csetnek and having captured him cast him from the precipitous promontory of a castle into the abyss.

But it was necessary to smite also the lords. First the avenging rage turned toward Lord *Perényi*. Accused of federation with the Turks, the king arrested and kept him in prison until death. So the Reformation was deprived of its first pillar. The hierarchy, in order to check the protection of the lords who patronized the Reformation, caused the king to send orders to the captains that they should set themselves against the proclaimers of the "heretic doctrines." *Váradí*, archbishop of Esztergom, ordered the Protestant ministers to be bound and dragged to Nagyszombat. When Charles V. cut down the troops of the federation in Germany the people turned yet more energetically against the purified doctrine. The Diet of Pozsony in 1548 passed a law with the purpose of bringing back the religion to the former state. It was ordered by articles that "prelates might be elected from men adorned with faith and knowledge, and who themselves should teach the flock. They should commission deans, subdeans and other persons whose duty was to teach the people; and to those, if they were not sufficient, good preachers must be added." So the attention of Ferdinand and of the country was turned by the persecuted Protestantism to the cause of science and education. In another order the states decided upon the eradication of the heresy; according to the eleventh article the Anabaptists and Sacramentarians (so were called the followers of Calvin) were to be driven away from the estates, and it was not allowed to tolerate them within the limits of the country.

The Diet of 1550 repeated that the old religion was to be restored and the heretics were to be persecuted. At the Diet of Sopron in 1553 the Roman clergy would order that no books be printed without their license, but *Nádasdi*, the palatine, prevented such a restriction of the liberty of the press.

Transylvania, the other district under Queen Isabella, presented a different picture. Her chief counselor, Bishop *Martinuzzi*, flew into a passion, when *Heltai* proclaimed the Gospel among the Saxons, but their political aid being wanted, he did not dare to disturb them any more. So the Saxons came to be devoted to the Reformation.

However, where political causes did not hinder, *Martinuzzi* was aroused with full severity against the purified faith. Noticing that in his diocese there were reformers, he issued an edict at the Diet of Debreczen (1545), that the Reformed ministers must not be endured. The Diet commissioned him and *Petrovics* to take them into custody. But it was impossible to stop the Reformation by violent means. It got so strong within a short time that the Diet of Torda in 1548 was satisfied with an order that the ministers must not leave their places.

§ 7. The Career of Sztárai, the Reformer.

Michael *Sztárai* was an educated monk who labored at Sárospatak and later at Laskó. He translated the psalms into Hungarian and with a sweet voice sang them before the people, who not having heard them before, thronged in great numbers to the singer. While surrounded by a multitude he began to explain in inflaming speeches that the mass, indulgence, ceremonies, etc., were all human inventions and of no use. He expounded the evangelical truths in a way so clear that his hearers in large numbers left their priests and joined him. His foes tried many times openly and secretly to get him out of the way, but his loving followers protected "his smooth and bald head."

In his triumphant reformatory tours he fought with the Roman clergy for seven years; he penetrated to districts beyond the Drava and aroused so much enthusiasm that two hundred congregations were organized within a short time.

After completing the tours he became pastor at Laskó. He visited the congregations with the authority of a bishop, and

ordained ministers for the new churches. Sztárai not only as a preacher, but also as a popular author propagated the principles of the Reformation. He wrote the life of Archbishop Cranmer and of Bishop Athanasius. With his stage play, "The Mirror of the True Priesthood"—consisting of three acts—he broke a new literary way. He also had it performed. He wrote another play on "The Marriages of the Priests." Sztárai was one of the greatest and most generally influential reformers in Hungary. His character was as impetuous and aggressive as that of Luther, to whose doctrine on the Lord's Supper he remained faithful until death. In other doctrines, however, he did not exhibit absolute attachment to Luther. Thus, especially through the influence of Kiss, the churches organized by him became flourishing Reformed congregations.

§ 8. The Career of Stephen Kiss of Szeged, the Reformer.

In his character Kiss was like to the mild Melanchthon. He was a professor, minister and literary author. This eminent person of the Hungarian Reformation was born at Szeged in 1505. In mature years he acquired knowledge at the universities of Vienna and Cracow. He too was touched by the breath of the free spirit and visited Wittenberg in his 37th year, where he received the degree of doctor of theology (1543).

After his return to Hungary Kiss began to labor at Csanád, but the cruel lord of this town despoiled him of two hundred books and drove him out of the city. So he set out for Gyula and later to Czegléd. As professor at the latter place he introduced Melanchthon's theology into the school. Petrovics, the chief captain of Temesvár, endeavored just at that time to organize there a school of higher degree. With keen foresight he invited Kiss to be a professor. In the town, as well as in the vicinity, under the powerful protection of Petrovics and by the zeal of Kiss, the cause of the Reformation received a great impulse. But when the town went into the possession of King Ferdinand, Kiss, together with the other ministers, was driven

away. He started a second time to move around. Tur received him in its school as a professor. Then he went to Békés, but here he was despoiled of his money and books by robbers among the German troops, and was compelled to flee. Then he removed beyond the river Danube and became a professor at Tolna, and later a minister at Laskó. From the boundary limit Kiss went to Kálmáncsa. But his enemies accused him before the pasha of going over to the territory of the neighboring kingdom to preach. The pasha lodged him in jail at Szolnok and scourged him. The whole vicinity was affected by the undeserved fate of the reformer. A delegation started in his interest to Buda in order to release him. But they were able to gain no more than the concession that he was allowed to work in his room bound in chains. A woman traveling through Szolnok was affected in her soul when she saw the learned reformer in this miserable position. She, on her deathbed, in tears, wrung from her husband a promise that he would release the reformer. The man made good his word and Kiss was taken out of the prison.

But in order to avoid further trouble Kiss left Kálmáncsa and removed to Ráczkeve, to his last ministerial station. In this territory he governed nearly thirty-five congregations—which bowed before his knowledge—with the authority of a bishop and ordained ministers. He raised the school of this town to success and fame. He called as his assistant *Skaricza*, born in Ráczkeve, and directed his education. He loved him as his own child, and helped him to go abroad.

Kiss was the most learned among the Hungarian reformers. He cultivated poetry also. His works were written in Latin, were published after his death, and were read throughout Europe. His work against the Unitarians, entitled “*De Trinitate*” was edited by Beza at Geneva. This great successor of Calvin called him a “champion worthy of eternal memory.” His best read work, “*The Mirror of the Roman Popes*,” was published by his son at the cost of the burghers of Ráczkeve. His largest theological book, “*Loci Communes*,”

saw daylight at Basle (1585). It reached five editions and was translated into German. Skaricza, his successor, gathered and edited his biography. He published also Kiss' picture, which he had drawn.

§ 9. The Organization of the Principality of Transylvania; the First Law Concerning Religious Liberty.

According to the jeering remarks of Archbishop Pázmány the Hungarian Protestant Church was organized by two Peters: Petrovics and Perényi. Both were indeed powerful pillars of the Reformation. Sad days came to the developing Protestantism when Perényi was imprisoned and Petrovics was banished from the country. Transylvania especially suffered very much from the conquering German troops. The magistrates had to swear by calling on the names of the saints and were obliged to persecute the followers of the reformed faith.

Thus the persecuted Protestants cast a look toward Sigismund John, the young son of King John, and urged the Turks to restore his country. The Sultan replaced Perényi in the government of Temes. Perényi waited for a favorable occasion to start a movement in the interest of Sigismund John. Indeed, at the Diet of Szászsebes (1556), Sigismund was elected prince of Transylvania. The diet declared against the Roman king (Ferdinand). So the principality of Transylvania became independent and to Queen Isabella was intrusted the government till the full age of her son.

Next year the Diet of Torda, urged by Perényi, added to the laws the noble decree that everybody might follow the faith which seemed to him right, and that no party might dare to show disrespect or violence while disputing with another. *This was the first law for religious liberty in Europe*, which came into existence as the beautiful revelation of the free Hungarian spirit. This law was the crowning accomplishment of Perényi, the champion of liberty. He passed away in the very same year.

II. THE FORMATION OF THE REFORMATORY MOVEMENT.

§ 10. *The Reformation of the Cities of Debreczen and Nagyvárad.*

Debreczen was already in the sixteenth century the most populous and imposing city of the Hungarian Lowland. It governed itself and elected its priests and magistrates. King John donated it to Valentine Török, his favorite adherent.

After Török had fallen into a Turkish prison, his wife, Catherine Pempflinger, lived at Debreczen. Her good will toward the Reformation is testified to by a contemporary historian in calling her "the Lutheran lioness." Trusting in her protection Valentine Kovács was the first to proclaim the purified faith at Debreczen. But the Diet of Debreczen (1545), moved by Bishop Martinuzzi, menaced the reformers with arrest and Kovács removed from the city.

The Reformation found its zealous patron in the son of Valentine Török. Under his protection the Reformation of the city made rapid progress. Rev. Radán and school principal Dézsi, a man of poetical inclination, publicly joined the Reformation in 1549. Radán prayed in this manner in his hymn to the "True Judge": "From the great idolatry (i. e., the veneration of the pictures) deliver us, for thy name's sake." The Franciscan monks who had a monastery and school at Debreczen, on account of the unfavorable conditions, left Debreczen and their school came into the possession of the city. In the autumn of 1551 Sztárai also appeared at Debreczen; he held a conference, and with the assuring letter of the Turkish pasha of Buda called and invited young ministers to the territory which had been under the Turkish dominion.

At the council of Beregszász in 1552 held under the protection of Petrovics, appeared also Radán, the reformer of Debreczen. At that time Lord Török allowed the Protestants to enter into the possession of the cathedral named after St. Andrew (the principal church of to-day), where since that

time the Gospel has been proclaimed uninterruptedly. The burghers from first to last accepted the corrected faith.

As the successor of the enthusiastic Radán, *Kálmáncsehi*, the favorite of Petrovics came to Debreczen. By him the Reformation extended and developed in a definite Reformed direction. Radán went to Beregszász. But while preaching there in the pulpit he was shot by a fanatical monk.

At *Nagyvárad* the military bishop for a long time made impossible everything in the interest of the Reformation. He drove out of the city *Lippai*, who had proclaimed here the Gospel. But after the capture of the city by Varkocs, the commander of Queen Isabella, the members of the chapter emigrated to the territory of King Ferdinand. The state occupied the estates of the bishop and chapter, and the palace of the bishop was remodeled to be the residence of the queen.

After the passing of the first law concerning religious liberty the Protestant congregation was organized at once. The monks removed from the city, the number of the Roman Catholics decreased, and many of their priests were converted to the Protestant faith. In the dominion of King John only eight noble families remained faithful to the Roman Church.

Czeglédi stood as first pastor at the head of the Protestant Church of *Nagyvárad* in 1557. By and by *Nagyvárad* with Debreczen became the metropolis of the Reformation of the Lowland.

§ 11. *The First Messengers of the Strict Reformed Doctrine.* *Martin Sánta Kálmáncsehi.*

The *Institutio*, the fundamental work of Calvin, in Hungary, as everywhere else, produced a great effect upon the mind. It caught Dévai, too, and afterward he became the first messenger of the Helvetic Reformation. For this reason he parted from his chief protectors, Nádasdi and Perényi, who remained Lutherans. Dévai was accused by Stoeckel before Luther (1544), who answered that he was not the one from whom Dévai learned the doctrine on the Lord's Supper.

On account of the death of Dévai and the behavior of several lords in protecting the Lutheran faith, the expansion of the Reformed doctrine was rendered difficult. But it gradually won men's souls. *Fejértói*, court-secretary of King Ferdinand, corresponding with Bullinger, wrote him in 1551 that in spite of the oppression many of the Hungarians were verging to the Helvetic view on the Lord's Supper.

At this juncture *Kálmáncsehi* came upon the scene as the pioneer of Calvinism. He had been a classmate of Dévai at Cracow. Some later hand, after his name in the register of the university, noted the following: "He introduced the first heresy of the Sacramentarians [it was the first sobriquet of the Reformed] into Hungary." This very learned humanist and canonist served as canon at Gyulafehérvár, but as a judge, at the first disputation of Segesvár in 1538, spoke favorably of the Reformation. Then he publicly joined Calvinism and was president of the council held at Beregszász (1552), and was zealous for the administration of the Lord's Supper from tables instead of altars. The council of Ovár in 1554 shows that many had become partisans of his view. Here eighty-eight ministers were present; this council declared the removal of pictures and altars to be the task of the magistracy.

Kálmáncsehi was called from Beregszász to Debreczen to fill the place of Radán (1554). Here with his bold preaching he gained the magistracy and took the altars, fonts and pictures from the churches. This puritan innovation embarrassed the protectors of the Reformation. Stoeckel inveighed severely against *Kálmáncsehi* and declared the adherents of the Reformed doctrine rebels against the country. In order to put a stop to the extension of the Reformed faith, Lord Báthory convoked a new council at Erdöd in 1555, where it was resolved in form of decrees that the body and blood of Christ are really present in the Lord's Supper; the auricular confession is to be continued; and the proclaimers of the false doctrine should be summoned before the court and lose their office.

In consequence of that decree the position of *Kálmáncsehi*

in Debreczen became dangerous. Again he joined Petrovics, his powerful protector, who at that time started to free Transylvania. So Kálmáncsehi introduced the Reformed conception also at Kolozsvár in 1556, where it began to be called a "Hungarian religion," in contrast with Lutheranism, which was accepted generally by the Saxons of Transylvania.

The pioneers of the Lutherans of that age—as pastor David and superintendent Hebler—entered the lists immediately with tongue and pen against the doctrine of Kálmáncsehi. In one year the contrast grew so sharp between the two denominations, that moved by Petrovics, this hero of great influence, the *first national council was convoked at Kolozsvár in 1557* in order to discuss and clear the contested questions. Kálmáncsehi could not be present because he was dangerously sick, and the final decision was made without him. A confession, entitled "Consensus doctrinæ," in which the doctrines of Luther were adopted and declared to be right, was prepared by the majority. And to seduce the Hungarians and Szeklers from the Reformed faith Dávid was the first who was elected superintendent over the Hungarians. This unfavorable turn for Calvinism was furthered by the deaths of Petrovics and Kálmáncsehi.

The Roman Catholics as well as the Lutherans most severely condemned the doctrines of Calvin. The provost of Arad in his statement called the doctrine of the non-presence of the body of Christ in the host as taught by Kálmáncsehi a "horrid monster." The Lutheran Hebler characteristically called his pamphlet, written to refute Kálmáncsehi, "Medicinal Herb for Insanity."

§ 12. *Foundation of the Reformed Church in the Territory of Transylvania.—Melius.*

The common agreement of the first national council held at Kolozsvár in 1557 was sent to Melanchton for decision. Melanchton in his letter approved of the conception of Luther. Then the Diet of Gyulafehervár (1558) set itself openly against the Reformed. By it the die was cast.

In this critical period, Peter *Tuhász*,—a man of strong character, great learning and matchless energy,—stood at the head of Calvinism at Debreczen. His name first appears in the register of the University of Wittenberg in 1556. Here he changed his name into the Greek (Melius), and afterward used both alternately. Debreczen called him to be its pastor and won over a great many of the Hungarian learned class and nobility for Calvinism, and even set Dávid to thinking.

At the conference of Nargyvárad (1559) Melius, with Dávid and the pastor at that place, set down in writing the first Reformed confession on the true meaning of the Lord's Supper. According to this the faithful ones receive the Lord's body and blood not with mouth but with heart; *i. e.*, spiritually. Dávid printed this writing in the same year, and it was accepted by the Szeklers of Transylvania at the council of Vásárhely. Then Melius, with his fellow ministers Szegedi and Czeglédi, meeting several times, made ready the first Hungarian Reformed Confession in Latin (1561). Next year Melius was elected bishop by the Transtibiscan Reformed people.

The confession of Melius which is called the Confession of Debreczen was accepted also by the Reformed elements in the Valley of Eger. (Here is derived the name, *confessio agrivalensis*.) The congregations along the river Theis accepted at the council of Tarczal (1562) the confession of Beza in a shortened and modified form. After a year the congregations of Transylvania acted likewise at the council which occurred at Torda (1563). Thus came into existence the Confession of Tarczal-Torda (Compendium doctrinæ christianæ).

By the influence of Melius and Dávid the magnates of Transylvania joined the Reformed faith in great number,—even the young king himself. This extension prompted the Saxo-Lutherans, together with Superintendent Hebler, to lay complaint against the church of Debreczen before four German universities. Melius took up his pen and in two Latin replies defended the Reformed doctrines.

In order to avoid the schism many conciliating councils were held in Transylvania. The prince himself convoked the last one, at Nagy-Enyed (1564). But, both parties failing to yield, coexistence became impossible. The prince, after a barren reconciliation, confirmed by law the liberty of the Reformed Church and appointed Dávid to be minister to his court and the first Reformed bishop of Transylvania. By it the schism between the two Protestant Churches was made final.

§ 13. The Organization of the Reformed Church in the Territory of the Hungarian Kingdom and in the Turkish Dominion.

In the territory of the Upper Theis, Perényi was the most powerful protector of the Lutheran doctrine. But his severe demeanor could not lead the Calvinists from their view. The classmate of Melius, minister and dean of Göncz, convoked a council in 1566, which, agreeing with the council of Tarczal, accepted the Confession of Beza and the Catechism of Calvin and rejected the popish host, this "perverse bread."

After the death of Perényi the vicinity of Sárospatak also gained freedom from the oppression. Czeglédi, the minister and dean of Sárospatak convoked the council of Sárospatak in 1568, which adopted the Reformed system of faith.

The ministers of the two sister denominations were at last together in the Transdanubian district. The storm broke out while Beythe was the superintendent under the influence of the "Formula Concordiae," made in rigid Lutheran spirit, which caused in Hungary, as in Germany, discordance instead of the purposed union.

In order to conciliate the followers of Luther and Calvin, Lord Nádasdy convoked a conference at Csepreg (1591). The dispute occurred especially between the rigid Lutheran Skulteti and Beythe, the latter inclining toward Calvin. When Beythe noticed that the others intended to judge him he left the conference indignantly. Then the Lutheran Nádasdy

expressed his thanks to Skulteti, and after giving the victory to the doctrines defended by Skulteti, ordered that the "Formula Concordiae" must be taught by the ministers in his territory under penalty of losing their position. But the schism did not become general.

The next year Pastor *Pathai* of Pápa published a small book on the Lord's Supper and adopted in it the doctrine of Calvin, upon which Beythe congratulated him. Skulteti, being excited by it, attacked Beythe passionately and refused to obey him as his superintendent. But Beythe resigned his office, and the Lutherans organized themselves in 1598, taking the "Formula Concordiae" as the basis of their faith. Beythe remained the superintendent of the Reformed element until death (1612).

The "Formula Concordiae" brought the sad consequence that everybody who did not sign it was excluded from the University of Wittenberg. Later the Hungarian Reformed youths went to the University of Heidelberg to increase their knowledge.

In the Hungarian territory which had been under Turkish dominion, the constructive minds of the Reformed Church were Stephen *Kiss* and *Skarica* his pupil and successor. Superintendent *Veresmarti*, agreeing with the latter, with his participation held the council of Herczegszöllös in 1576, where about forty ministers were present.

§ 13. *Disputes with the Unitarians.*

The Hungarian Reformed Church had scarcely attained an independent existence when a new peril menaced it. The anti-trinitarian doctrine was infiltrated into Hungary, promulgated especially by *Blandrata*, a physician to the court, a man of Italian origin. He gained the wavering and unsettled Dávid and, acting with him, developed zeal in the interest of Unitarianism.

But the Reformed also entered the lists with full force against the destructive movement. Professor *Károlyi* and

Bishop Melius took up the great combat against Dávid, who fought with transcending eloquence. At the council of Gyulafehérvár (1566), where the prince also was present, Melius won the victory. The prince conferred special honors upon him. But Dávid continued fighting with tongue and pen. Melius then convoked a council at Debreczen (1567), in which ministers of seventeen Trans- and Cistibiscan classes were present. Here the *Second Helvetic Confession* was adopted and in contrast with the Unitarians they declared their views with constant faith. The *Short Confession of the Ministers* (*Brevis confessio pastorum*) was published in Latin and in Hungarian.

The cohesion and organization of the Reformed manifested at the council at Debreczen was needed so much the more because in the meantime the young prince also was won over to Unitarianism. Joint debates were held at Gyulafehérvár for ten and at Nagyvárad for six days and the young prince closed the dispute with the declaration that in his country liberty was to be prevalent in every respect. From that time the Unitarians separated entirely from the Reformed and elected Dávid as their superintendent.

The ministers of the environs of Theis stood firm for the doctrines of Calvin. Melius held another council at Csenger in 1570 and invited also the pioneers of the Unitarians for a decisive combat. But neither Blandrata nor Dávid appeared. The council prepared a confession which is a forcible expression of the doctrines of Calvin and at the same time a protestation against Unitarianism. The Confession of Csenger was included also in the international collection of the Reformed confessions.

The Unitarians got stronger and stronger. The Diet of Marosvásárhely in 1571 declared the liberty of the Unitarian religion. Dávid did not stop with the Unitarian standpoint, but went to the limit of Judaism, and for it died in jail. His great rival, Bishop Melius died in 1572.

318 *History of the Reformed Church of Hungary.*

The Unitarians were fortunate in occupying space in the Turkish territory as well as in the Transdanubian district. But after a while their number decreased and they preserved themselves only in Transylvania and this is true of them to this time.

§ 14. *Confessional Consolidation of the Hungarian Church.*

Originally the Hungarian Protestant congregations—speaking the Hungarian, German and Slovak languages—adopted and followed the Confession of Augsburg, which was of great authority. But in 1610 the “Formula Concordiae” was adopted.

In spite of this extravagant Lutheran confession, on the one hundredth anniversary of the Reformation the idea of uniting the two denominations was discussed. The “Irenicum” of *Pareus* was honored with a premium by Prince Bethlen and it was translated into Hungarian by his pupil *Samarjay* in 1628. But this ideal purpose was violently attacked by the Lutheran *Letenyei* and thus the hope of union struck upon a reef.

The Reformed followed first the Variant Confession of Augsburg. At the council of Debreczen (1567) the Second Helvetic Confession, moved by Melius and his companions, was adopted. The Reformed beyond the river Danube also accepted it at the council of Komjáth in 1623 and those along the Danube in 1642. At last the national council at Szathmárnémeti made it compulsory, and it became a common symbol of the Hungarian Church.

The Catechism of Heidelberg was first adopted at the great council of Debreczen (1567), which ordered that it be explained in the churches. The Reformed beyond the Danube acted likewise. The national council occurred at Szatmárnémeti made it compulsory for three districts.

The first Hungarian translation of the Catechism appeared at Papa in 1577, the second one at Debreczen in 1604. In 1616 pastor *Czene* made a translation of the Second Helvetic confession and it appeared at the cost of Lord-lieutenant *Rhédei*; Princess *Lorántfi* edited the same in 1654.

III. THE REFORMATION IN A STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE;
ITS VICTORY.

§ 16. *The Persecution of Protestantism in Hungary.*

The aggressive campaign of the Roman prelates against the Reformation began with Archbishop *Oláh*, who is called by Roman Catholic authors the savior of the Hungarian Catholic Church. At the council of *Nagyszombat* in 1560 he caused to be instituted a Roman Catholic confession of faith. He settled the Jesuits in Hungary (1561) and provided them with the revenues of two provostships. He commissioned visitors and gave them power to remove the Protestant pastors and teachers who had not been ordained by a Roman Catholic bishop. Many were summoned before the archbishop, and others were set before an inquisitory court; for instance Teacher *Somogyi*, who only after a long torture was released from the prison.

Verancsics, the bishop of *Eger* and commander of the fort, also set himself severely against the Protestants. He arrested four ministers in his vicinity and released them only under condition that they remove to a distance of one hundred miles from the city. He called upon the Protestants of the garrison to dismiss their pastors, and when they failed to do so he accused them of being associated with the Turks. The royal commissioners elicited the weakness of this charge. *Huszár*, the worthy and industrious reformer, also felt the persecuting power of the prelates.

Bishop *Draskovics* and *Telegdi* manifested a great fervency in defending the Roman Catholic faith. *Telegdi* pursued especially *Bornemisza*, the reformer and superintendent of *Mátyusföld*. *Telegdi* was exceeded in oppressing Protestantism by the powerful *Draskovics*, who as bishop and governor of *Croatia* stifled the Reformation with iron hands. He not only permanently settled the Jesuits, but secured the rich provostship of *Turócz* for them. As the royal commissioner, he ordered the common use of the Gregorian calendar and era.

The persecution reached its highest point at the time of Archbishop *Forgách*, who, being the apostate son of a Protestant lord, with the bigotry of a convert waged war against the Reformation. On his advice King Rudolf appointed General *Barbiano* the governor of Upper Hungary. He occupied the cathedral of *Kassa*, which had been for fifty years in the possession of the Protestants, with a military force, and surrendered it to the chapter of *Eger*. He drove the Protestant ministers from the city and forbade the Protestant worship. Those who set themselves against his order he imprisoned or laid under a contribution, and occupied the estates in the protesting city. In vain the delegates of *Kassa* applied to the king; they were not given an audience. Inquisition was ordered under the leadership of the violent *Szuhay*, bishop of *Eger*.

A similar policy was pursued by Provost *Pethé*. On the ground of a commission received from the king he drove the Protestant ministers out of the thirteen towns of the Zips. He occupied the Protestant churches and surrendered them to the Roman priests. Throughout the territory of the kingdom the persecution against liberty of conscience was everywhere the order of the day.

§ 17. *The Persecution of Protestantism in Transylvania.*

In Transylvania under the reign of the Roman Catholic *Báthory* there was a stronger reaction against the Reformation. The diet of 1579 consented to the settlement of the Jesuits, and in 1581 they opened a high school at *Kolozsvár*.

The Jesuits, getting strong in Hungary also, secretly laid the scheme of uniting Transylvania with Hungary under the Hapsburgs and of restoring the golden age of the Roman Church on the ruins of Protestantism. This plan, which menaced the independence of Transylvania, came to light, and the Jesuits had to leave Transylvania. But soon they returned, dressed in the disguise of canons, and were successful in persuading Prince Sigismund to make alliance with King

Rudolph against the Turks. This step, too, was directed against the independence of Transylvania. The prince stifled the Protestant lords with slaughter. The lords, excited by the bloodshed, complied with the desire of the prince and set aside the former decrees against the Jesuits (1595). In the same year Sigismund surrendered Transylvania to King Rudolph and removed to the principality of Oppeln, which he received in exchange for Transylvania.

The harshest period ensued for Transylvania and for the Protestants. King Rudolph sent General *Básta* into Transylvania as a plenipotentiary, and he, surrounded by the Jesuits, and following their suggestions, became the hero of the period which has been called after his name. Even the fanatical king himself supported him in annihilating the Protestants. "We do not desire anything more zealously," he wrote in his letter to *Básta*, "than to extinguish the godless heresy from the country and to strengthen the orthodox Catholic faith." The Jesuits waited for the serenity of a golden age; the Protestants were secretly sighing for a saviour.

§ 18. *The First War for Religious Liberty.—Bocskay.*

Final destruction menaced the liberties of Hungary and Transylvania. The foreign and mercenary troops of *Básta* and *Barbiano*, by their spoliation, brought the people to beggary. These troops even desecrated the resting places of the dead.

The exasperation was increased in 1604 by the Diet of *Pozsony*, which not only failed to alleviate the injuries of the Evangelical lords, but inflicted new ones. When twenty-one articles were sent to the king for confirmation, he, in violation of the plain provisions of the constitution, added the twenty-second article. In his infamous article he declared that he hoped to recognize a flourishing Roman Catholic faith as the dominant religion also in Hungary, which was flooded by heresies. Therefore he renewed the laws ordered by all his predecessors against the Protestants. At the diet he marked

those who were disputing in religious matters as disquieting and disturbing elements. With this article the insult to the constitution reached its culminating point.

At this critical time arose the defender of religious and political liberties in the person of Stephen Boeskay. He was the captain and lord lieutenant of *Bihar* and was called upon to stand at the head of a movement inaugurated by Hungarians who had fled into the territory under Turkish dominion. Boeskay accepted the call and within a short time conquered the whole of Upper Hungary. He summoned a diet at *Szerencs* (1605), where the religious liberties both of the Roman Catholics and Protestants were declared and with enthusiasm Rœskay was elected prince of Hungary and Transylvania. The pasha of Buda, commissioned by the Sultan, offered him a crown and a political alliance. But he refused.

Grand Duke *Matthias*, brother of King Rudolph, perceiving that the interests of the dynasty were in peril, entered into negotiation through his delegates with Boeskay. After a long discussion the representatives of the parties came to an agreement in Vienna. The terms of the treaty were signed on June 23, 1606. It was the important *Peace of Vienna*, the fundamental scourge of the liberty of the Hungarian Protestant Church. King Rudolph signed it unwillingly, and only at the request of Matthias; but the king pieced out the first article, concerning religion, with a clause according to which "the estates are allowed to have religious liberty in the royal and market towns, but without violence to the Roman Catholic religion." The original point of agreement being deprived of its essence by this clause, Boeskay sent it back without his signature. Then Matthias declared that the clause was not added because of unfriendly intention, and pointed out that it would be the duty of the next diet to resolve the difficulties.

In the same year Prince Boeskay convoked the diet at *Kassa*. At that time he was already sick unto death, but personally opened the diet. In his address he said: "The liberty

of our faith, conscience and old laws is to be estimated higher than gold." The estates accepted the terms of the agreement with the following important reservations: (1) The liberty of religion was to be extended to the villages also; (2) the clause "without violence to; etc.," was to be set aside; (3) the Jesuits were not allowed to live in the country, nor to have estates.

The prince, together with the estates, signed these decrees on December 22, 1606, and he died seven days later. He was poisoned by his secretary, whom the excited multitude massacred at the market of Kassa.

Bocskay was great in defeat as well as in success. The former did not shake him; the latter failed to carry him away. He was an excellent soldier, a wise diplomat and humble Christian. The achieving and securing of the religious liberties of the Hungarian Protestant Church are connected with his name.

After the death of Bocskay the king and those who were about him used every effort to prevent the legitimation of the agreement. The king appointed *Forgách*, the most stubborn enemy of Protestantism, to be archbishop of Esztergom, and the pope hurried to excite him to greater action with the hat of the cardinalate. "Better that Hungary perish than to have religious liberty," he used to say. At that time Grand Duke Matthias arose against his brother and compelled him to resign. The Diet of *Pozsony* (1608) enacted into law the first article of the peace of Vienna, and Matthias, who was elected king of Hungary, assented to the important appendix that the Protestants should be excepted from the supremacy of the Roman Catholic bishops and be placed under their own superintendents. In this article is the root of the Protestant autonomy.

§ 19. *The Strengthening of the Roman Catholic Party.*

The prelates protested against inscribing into the laws the Peace of Vienna, but Pope Paul V. went yet further in de-

claring by a brevet that the prelates were not obliged to hold to the law of 1608.

After the death of Forgács, the Jesuit Pázmány was appointed archbishop of Esztergom (1616). He was a son of Reformed parents and had been converted to the Roman faith in his thirteenth year. He was a pupil of *Bellarmin* and consented with *Khlesl*, bishop of Vienna, in uttering the dictum that "the divine power allows only one religion; Christ cannot have concord with Belial." Pázmány was a man of great genius and of distinguished education. He began with zeal the fanatical work of the Counter-Reformation. He issued orders to occupy the Protestant churches. "Better that the community perish, that the peasants leave it, than to let the Protestants have the churches," Pázmány used to say frequently. Directed by this principle, at the diet held in 1619 the Roman party succeeded in suppressing from the assuring letter of the king the clause that religious liberty was allowed, together with the use of the church buildings. According to the dangerous explanation of Pázmány, the religious liberty could not touch the right of the lords; therefore the Roman Catholic lords were entitled to drive out the preachers of the Gospel from the churches of the community and to put Roman priests into them. This theory became a new curse of the country.

The threat being dangerous the estates urged in vain to expel the Jesuits, who, however, remained, and their school at *Nagyszombat* was frequented by five hundred pupils, among them many Protestants. They lured and rewarded apostate Protestants with honorable positions, estates and dignities. As an author Pázmány reached a matchless effect with his polemic work, entitled, "The Guide to Truth."

In the face of numerous and forcible conversions the Protestants became desperate. During the thirty years' war *Ferdinand II.* was crowned king of Hungary by Pázmány. The young king had been a pupil of the Jesuits, and, imbued with the greatest fanaticism, in his youth he made a pilgrimage

to Loretto, to Mary's miracle-performing picture. Here he made a vow confirmed with oath that he would extinguish heresy from his country even with the peril of his own life. This vow he reaffirmed at Rome before the pope. He averred many times that he would be willing to end his life with the sword if he could abolish the heresy with his own life and if he could cause every subject to return into the Roman Catholic fold. From his hereditary provinces in Austria he banished the Protestants.

But he failed to manage Hungary so easily. In the beginning of his reign he convoked a diet in 1619, where he called on the states to take up arms for the suppression of the Bohemian revolution, which in spite of him gained strength. But the Protestants insisted upon the restoration of their churches. The palatine, on account of the hard times, forbade discussion of religious injuries, and Pázmány expressed himself as follows: "It were better that the country be given up to wolves and foxes than to heretics." The space between the two parties was not to be crossed over. The questions could be settled only by resort to arms and after the spilling of much blood.

§ 20. *The Second War for Religious Liberty—Bethlen.*

The oppressed Protestants applied to Gabriel *Bethlen*, prince of Transylvania, who hurried with a deep religious conviction and patriotic fervor to defend the religious and national liberties of the Hungarians. The Protestants of Upper Hungary, nearly all the people, enthusiastically joined the great movement whose motto was "the honor of God and the liberty of the nation." The troops of Bethlen went quickly forward. The town of *Pozsony* and the palatine did homage to him, and the crown of the country went into his possession. The diet convened in 1620 ordered religious liberty. Further, it was added that the principal church should be in the possession of that denomination to which the majority of the community belonged, and that defenders of religion should be elected. The Jesuits were banished from the country.

In the meantime the war went on. The king, being in straitened circumstances, at last entered into negotiation with Bethlen. But agreement was impossible because Bethlen wanted to include in the peace his Bohemian and Moravian allies and the delegates of the king protested and went away.

The break being complete, Bethlen was elected king of Hungary. He accepted the crown, but, knowing the instability of fortune, with foresight he postponed the coronation. However, he confirmed the laws. A favorable turn now set in for the Roman party. The Bohemians were defeated by the troops of King Ferdinand II. at the siege of Weissenberg (1621). Thus peace was concluded between Bethlen and Ferdinand II., at *Nikolsburg* on December 31, 1621. The terms of the peace of Vienna were confirmed. The country did not gain new rights, but the old ones were maintained in their integrity by Bethlen, who was acknowledged by Ferdinand II. as "prince of the Holy Roman Empire." Later he was compelled twice to take up arms to defend the constitution and Protestantism.

Bethlen was great as a commander,—he was victorious forty-four times,—righteous as a prince, and tolerant and magnanimous as a man. He was tenacious of his Reformed religion,—he read through the Bible twenty-six times,—but did not persecute those following other creeds. In his country the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, the Unitarians, the Anabaptists and the Jews enjoyed undisturbed religious liberty. He respected the missionary and literary zeal of the Jesuits also. He helped ten schools, founded a Reformed college at *Gyulaféhérvar* and called in scholars of great fame from abroad.

Bethlen died in his forty-ninth year (1629). He endured a long sickness with wonderful resignation and with an unmovable trust in God. In his last hour, when he could not talk, he noted down these biblical words: "If God be for us, who can be against us? Nobody; certainly nobody."

§ 21. *The Third War for Religious Liberty—Rákóczi I.*

After the death of Bethlen, Archbishop *Pázmány* and Palatine *Eszterházy* continued the Counter-Reformation more ardently than ever. Many lords, following their example, renewed the persecution of the Protestants. The new king, *Ferdinand III.*, followed in the old steps. After the death of *Pázmány* (1637) he appointed *Lósi* to be archbishop. *Lósi* in turn donated estates to the Jesuits. He even surrendered them the Protestant church of *Nagyszombat*.

Under such circumstances began the Diet of *Pozsony* in 1637. The Protestants desired relief, but the palatine flatly declared that he could not give back the churches at all, and the peasants were compelled to follow the religion of their lord. Then the Protestant estates appealed to the king. The royal reply declared this proceeding of the Protestants to be unusual and illegal. Finally the royal document refused to take cognizance of the religious injuries.

The discontented Hungarians hoped again for assistance from Transylvania to improve their position. Here George *Rákóczi I.* sat on the throne of the princes. He was a worthy successor of Bethlen, whom he held as his example. He was a wise, energetic governor, a Reformed prince of matchless zeal and of rare piety. His motto was: "Non est currentis, neque volentis, sed miserentis Dei" (Rom. 9: 16). As Bethlen had done, he went with preachers and Bibles everywhere. He was the shelter and bulwark of his church.

After he had captured Upper Hungary and his troops, united with those of *Forstenson*, the glorious Swedish commander, had menaced the hereditary provinces in Austria, the terrified *Ferdinand III.* showed himself inclined to conclude a peace. Thus came into existence the *Peace of Linz* in 1645.

According to this peace, (1) everybody was to follow his religious conviction freely and without impediment, and was to have the use of the church buildings, bells and cemeteries; (2) religious liberty was to be extended also to the peasants, whom the lords were not allowed to compel to observe other cere-

monies; (3) the Protestant ministers were not to be banished; (4) the taking of the churches was to be stopped; (5) the transgressors of the laws concerning religion were to be punished. It was made the duty of the next diet to settle the other questions and enact laws concerning religion. All this happened at the Diet of Pozsony in 1646. When the archbishop protested against the articles, the king confirmed them with a clause as follows: "The objection of the Roman clergy and Roman Catholic laical persons will not be taken into consideration, but will be invalid."

George Rákóczi I. died several days previous to the peace of Westphalia. Hungarian Protestantism reached the culmination of its political power during the reigns of Bethlen and Rákóczi.

IV. CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

§ 22. *The Origin of the Ecclesiastical Districts.*

The Reformed Church of Hungary at the present time is divided into five ecclesiastical districts, each being headed by a bishop (sometimes called superintendent). The history of the origin of the districts may be stated briefly as follows:

1. *Transtibiscan District.*—A beginning was made in 1554 by the council of Ovár. Originally it included both Lutherans and Reformed. The strict Reformed district was organized in 1562 and Melius was its first bishop.

2. *Transylvania District.*—The first district in Transylvania was organized in 1553. It was Lutheran and Saxon. The first bishop of the Hungarian Lutherans was Dávid in 1556. But after he was converted to Calvinism he resigned. He became the first bishop of the separated Reformed district in 1564. When he again changed his religion (1567) the Reformed remained for a while without a bishop, but from 1577 the Transylvania district became permanent, with which the Hungarian Lutherans also were afterward identified.

3. *Cistibiscan District.*—Originally the congregations in this territory did not elect a bishop, but organized into four

deaneries (classes) governed by deans, and the organization was called "unio inter quattuor dioeceses." In 1648 a permanent president was elected. But the united classes held back from the episcopal government as late as 1735, when *Szentgyörgyi* was the first bishop.

4. *Cisdanubian District*.—In this territory two superintendencies existed formerly. About 1570 they were united and *Veresmarti* was elected bishop.

5. *Transdanubian District*.—This was formed from two bishoprics: (1) The bishopric of *Rába*. Its first superintendents governed the Lutherans and Reformed. In 1612 *Pathai* was elected bishop of the separated Reformed district. He was the first who organized consistories according to the example of the churches of the Pfalz; (2) the bishopric of *Mátyusföld*. Here, too, the Lutherans and Reformed were together. The Reformed district was organized in 1616, while *Czene* was the bishop.

§ 23. *The Presbyterial Movement.*

In the beginning only the congregations of Upper Hungary were attached to the polity of the Genevan Church. The others were under episcopal reign.

The news of the fight in England against Episcopacy reached Hungary and *Szilvásujfalvi*, professor, later pastor and dean of *Nagyvárad* first arose against the polity of the bishops (1608). He asserted that there was no need of bishops; that the episcopal office led to hierarchy. On account of his views he was declared "a disturber and innovator." The council of *Nagyvárad* removed him from office and on request of Bishop *Hodászi* a jury consisting of ecclesiastical and laical persons sentenced him to jail. He suffered in prison till Prince Bethlen mitigated his sentence to exile.

But not long after, the presbyterian movement was aroused again with full force. Its head was *Tolnai*. He went to study at Franekera and here was the pupil of *Amesius*. Thence, together with ten Hungarian students, he went over

to England, where the Scotch Presbyterians under the leadership of *Cromwell* fought against the Roman Catholics and Protestant Episcopilians. Tolnai and his companions formed a union at London (1638), with the purpose of realizing the presbyterian form of government in Hungary.

In the meantime under the influence of the foreign movements, it was decided by the councils in Hungary that the youth returning from abroad must take an oath that they would not introduce innovations in ceremonies, confessions and government without the consent of a general council (1638).

After six years of study Tolnai returned from abroad and held back from taking the oath. As professor and dean he drew to himself a great party. At the council of *Tokaj* (1646) he was accused and appealed his case to Prince Rákóczi I., who convoked a national council at *Szatmárnémeti* on June 10, 1646, of which the president was Bishop *Geleji* of Transylvania. Here Tolnai was found guilty and was removed from office, together with his eight fellow ministers. Then thirty decrees were passed in order to defend the authority and rights of the episcopal polity. Further, *Geleji* was commissioned to draw up ecclesiastical laws for the strengthening of the church government. So came into existence the one hundred canons of *Geleji*, which were inspired by the principles of moderate episcopal government. *Geleji* acknowledged the right of the presbyteries, but he did not hold that their organization would be apposite to the times. The prince and those who were around him did not sympathize with Presbyterianism, because the revolution of *Cromwell* beheaded King Charles I. and abolished the kingship. The constitution of the estates was also unfavorable to the democratic principles. Presbyterianism was known in Hungary as the "English spleen."

After the death of Tolnai, *Medgyesi*, minister of *Sárospatak*, took up the flag of Presbyterianism. He edited a work on "Elders governing the Church" (1650), defended the presbyterian government in contrast with the episcopal form, and

suggested the idea of double presidency (clerical and laical) to counterbalance the hierarchy. But the councils removed two pastors who had taken the side of Medgyesi, and by the civil magistracy put them in jail (1655). The ministers recanted and were set at liberty.

Thus Presbyterianism was practically suppressed in Hungary. After the death of Prince *George Rákóczi II.* under the weight of the blows which fell upon the country and Protestantism, the Reformed Church had to struggle for its existence. The internal controversies were dropped, that all might take up the war against the common enemy. Thus the government of the bishops was fortified.

(*To be continued.*)

III.

THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE FRENCH CHURCHES.

BY LOUISE SEYMOUR HOUGHTON.

I.

The opening chapter of the Separation Law, which sets forth its principles, begins thus:

Article First. The Republic assures liberty of conscience. It guarantees the free exercise of public worship (*des cultes*^{*}) under the sole restrictions hereinafter set forth in the interests of public order.

This is a very marked advance upon the condition of things until then prevailing. Up to the passage of this law there was no liberty of public worship without the previous permission of the local government. Any communal mayor might prevent the holding of an extra or irregular service. The great advantage that the McAll mission has always had over the churches is that its boats have had, so to speak, a blanket permit from the central government, covering all times and places, and from a very early day this mission, founded immediately after the downfall of the Commune, not being a church nor connected with any church, and evidently making for local order, enjoyed certain special privileges.†

Furthermore, up to the passage of this article it has been illegal to hold religious services elsewhere than in a church,

* Recent French writers have in vain sought an exact definition of the word *culte*, including, as it does, the idea of public worship, and the idea of a Church as the embodiment of a belief, a mode of worship, a principle of organization.

† "Go where you will," said the Prefect of the Seine to Mr. M'All in 1873, "establish as many stations as you please, for I have found that wherever you open a mission station, there I need fewer policemen."

temple, chapel or synagogue. To lend a room for a parlor or cottage meeting, or a barn for a revival service, was until December 9, 1905, a state's prison offence, *even if the meeting had been authorized*, and although the breach of this law has long been overlooked, there is no knowing how soon a radical government might not have made it effective, but for this article.

The second article of this chapter begins with a sentence which has probably been more often quoted since its introduction into the Chamber of Deputies than any other in the language, however classic. "The Republic neither recognizes, nor salaries, nor subventions any church (*culte*)."¹ It goes on to decree the suppression of the budgets of public worship, state, departmental and communal, and of payment of any expenses relative to the exercise of religion. A notable concession to religion is made, however, by laying upon state, departmental and communal budgets the salaries of chaplains, and all other expenses requisite to secure the free exercise of worship in such public establishments as high schools, colleges, schools, hospitals, asylums and prisons—such worship having been suppressed by law not many years ago.

In reporting this bill M. Briand recognized that notwithstanding the minute care of the committee it would need to be amended, and urged that amendment should always lean toward liberality. As a matter of fact, this has invariably been the case. The law is far less drastic, far more considerate of the religious sentiment, than the bill that was introduced into the Chamber.

The law affirms the duty of public officials to secure to every one liberty of conscience. The state is neutral, but well wishing; lay, but the protector of believers. It ignores the various forms of worship and church government; the churches henceforth neither enjoy privileges nor lie under official obligations. This fact came home to the Protestants, to whom as to all Frenchmen official rank is dear, when last New Year's Day for the first time the pastors of Paris received no invitation to

the Elysée palace. Till this year they had attended upon public functions as officials of State, being next in rank to cardinals and archbishops and equal to bishops.

This bill, after stout debate, was passed in a spirit of deep seriousness. As the work had progressed the Deputies appeared more and more to feel the gravity of their task. The final result was a law relatively good, generally acceptable, and in some particulars large and liberal. Many particulars which seem contrary to the full liberty of the churches, such as that which gives (Article XXI.) to the Registry Administration and the General Inspection of Finances the right of control (inspection) of the finances of religious associations and unions, are due to actual conditions or to conditions recently changed, but which continue to influence the public mind.

The passage of this law was no doubt the bravest act in the history of the Third Republic. A hundred and sixteen years before, the Revolution had tried to do the same thing, had laid down the principles of separation of Church and State, and for a brief moment had actually put them in force; but the progress of the Revolution soon swept away all religion. Under Napoleon I. the Church was bridled by the State, under the Restoration, as a French writer has recently said, the Church was wedded to the State; under the Second Empire it once again and more than ever became subject, absolutely in the hands of the Emperor. At last the Republic has cut the Gordian knot.

During all these hundred and sixteen years, therefore, an epic struggle has been raging in France, which has yet to find its Homer. The battle between the future and the past, between Absolutism personified in the Bourbon line, in the Bonaparte family, and in a monarchical conception of the Church, and Liberty embodied in the principles of the Revolution and the ever-growing passion for religious freedom, have been joined in battle all these years. The struggle has been fierce and bloody, now one side and now the other has won

temporary triumph, but until last December no decisive victory had been won. Even the establishment of the Third Republic was not a decisive victory, for the leaders were slow to discover the permanent character of their work, the might of the popular will. Not until the abolition of the Concordat and the Separation of Church and State on December 6, 1905, was anything like permanent advance achieved. This is not the end, but it is the beginning of the end. First of all the nations of Europe France has emancipated the human soul: religion has ceased to be a function of government. As yet, like Lazarus called forth from the tomb, the soul of France is fettered with its grave clothes. It may be long before they are quite unloosed, and the soul set perfectly free: but of one thing we may be sure: in this as in all things else, France will not be content to stop short of perfection. Before all peoples of the world France is consumed with the thirst of the ideal. The passion for truth is in the very fiber of its being. Light-hearted, volatile, frivolous as the French people appear upon the surface, cheerful as their own sunny climate, and with a marvellous capacity for recovery from disaster or calamity, the French character is at bottom one of indomitable tenacity, of deep and terrible earnestness, which is only redeemed from the dark bigotry to which such qualities naturally tend, by that love of truth and of freedom which every page of their history shows.

The very hold of the Roman Catholic Church upon this people, the romantic loyalty of this Eldest Daughter of the Church to the Holy See, were largely due, as Laveleye acutely pointed out, to her passion for truth. Rome spoke to her with the voice of authority and she listened with eager hope to find that truth for which her soul panted. The defeat of this hope drove many of the French people into scepticism, mysticism, *flirtage avec le divin* as Professor Barrés called the spiritualistic vagaries of the ninth decade of the century, atheism—yet all these are but the “other side out” of idealism. The sanctions of French conduct are always ideal—glory, fame, a prin-

ciple, rather than material profit, money and the advantages that money will buy.

This idealism explains the conduct of the French people, Catholic as well as Protestant, since the enactment of the law —the dissensions in the Protestant Synod, the Catholic resistance to the inventory of religious property. Like the Athenians, but far more seriously, the French people are “excessively religious.” The author of the Epistle to the Romans precisely describes them: they have a zeal for God but not according to knowledge. With them religion and politics are one. From the days of Charlemagne to the founding of the Third Republic all their religious questions were political; since then all their political questions have been religious. There is no other state in the world to-day where religion is so essentially the dominant concern as it is in France.

In judging of the significance of the event which took place on the ninth of last December it is first of all important to recognize that neither that law, nor its predecessor, the Associations law, was motived by a spirit of hostility to religion. Both measures are not only essentially measures of liberty, precisely in line with the advance of humanity, they are also the outcome of the most profound religious reverence, reverence for the rights of the human conscience.

Nor was this measure, as many writers insist, due to the iniquities of the Roman Catholic Church: the French mind is too perspicacious not to appreciate the great debt of civilization to the Roman Catholic Church. Catholicism saved Europe in the Middle Ages, and without her fostering care, much that is noblest and most formative in the thought of that period would have been lost. The Church has indeed made many blunders, and the mistakes of an infallible church are almost crimes, but it is not these that have brought about the separation of Church and State in France. This measure is the inevitable result of an irresistible current of opinion, a current which has swept over Italy, is making itself strongly felt in Switzerland and Austria, and is by no means feeble in

Germany and Great Britain. In this, as in so many things of the spirit, France simply takes the lead, in the endeavor so to turn this current as to make it sweep away all that hinders the emancipation of the human conscience.

It was no new thing when Napoleon I. established a concordat between the French State and the Holy See. There have been concordats all along the centuries. The desire for temporal power ideally held by the Roman hierarchy is entirely spiritual: it seeks for temporal power and material privileges simply as a means to the great end for which the Christian Church exists—the refashioning the earth after the Christian conception, the ideal City of God. But the inevitable tendency, among all but the most saintly and devoted minds, is to stop short with the temporal advantages of any condition of things; and hence by degrees came those encroachments of the Church upon the authority of states which reached their climax in Pope Hildebrand, with the corresponding submission of temporal rulers personified in Frederic Barbarossa. Four hundred years ago France, in which the instinct of freedom has from the earliest ages been indomitable, took upon itself to make distinct the boundary between the temporal and the spiritual power of the Church. The first Concordat, signed in 1510 between Francis I. and Pope Leo X., was the first step toward that separation of Church and State of which not the last, but thus far the most decisive step, was taken in the law of last December.

The law then promulgated is crude, as all pioneer laws must be. It will be revised, reworked, perfected by succeeding legislatures; and it depends entirely upon the conduct of the Christian people of France whether the first amendments shall be a genuine improvement along the line of religious liberty, or another of those reversions toward anti-religious despotism which the history of human progress shows not to be abnormal. If the advice of the Abbé Hemmer could be followed, and all branches of Christianity in France unite to watch over the interests of religion in a spirit of true liberty

and large recognition, each of the others' qualities, continuous advance would follow as surely as the night the day. But divided counsels in both Catholicism and Protestantism seem to forbid the immediate realization of such a program.

Here it is necessary to recall to mind that Protestantism is not an exotic on the soil of France. France is its birthplace, and its early home. Five years before Luther nailed up his theses Lefévre, professor in the Sorbonne, had clearly proclaimed the doctrine of justification by faith. For a few years the prospect was that Protestantism would become the dominant religion. The Court and the nobles professed it, the common people welcomed it; but political considerations prevailed, and in 1533 France made the choice that has cost her so dear in tears and blood.*

The principle of the Concordat or contract between Church and State, which was established in the 16th century, was not admitted by the Church of Rome without a struggle. It became, however, a fact, and the tendency has ever since been more and more to limit the temporal privileges of the clergy, and to confine the Church more and more to the spiritual domain. However this tendency may have been opposed by the clergy at large, the brightest and most devout minds in the Church have always recognized it to be the true order of things. The Fénélons, the Lacordaires, the Montalemberts, the Cardinal Darboys of the past, not to mention the brilliant leaders of the new Catholicism of to-day, the Abbés Loisy, Klein, Hemmer, the Counts de Mun and d'Haussonville, have always been perspicacious to see that temporal power is in fact a drag upon the true functions and the expansive power of the Church; the paradox being notably true that the more profound and far-reaching the spiritual influence of the Church the more profound and far-reaching must be, in the

* Here let me explain that although Protestants decline to concede to the "Papal" church a monopoly of the title Catholic, and adherents of that church in America are entirely content, as Archbishop Corrigan once told me, to be known as Roman Catholics, yet in France the legal name of that church is Catholic, and so it is here called.

very nature of things, its influence upon temporal institutions, laws, governments, and even property.

The Catholic religion, however, remained the religion of the French State, the Concordats had no other conception of things. Its organization constituted an arm of the State parallel with all other public organs of function. Theoretically and logically, therefore, heresy was contrary to the rights of the monarch, because the functions of the Church of Rome were exercised *in the name of the State*. But there is no intelligent Catholic, in any country, least of all in France, who does not recognize that, theory and logic notwithstanding, his Church owes a debt to Protestantism for its purely spiritual conception that religion as a sphere of human activity is entirely divested of any temporal purpose. From the proclamation of religious liberty in the French Revolution, as one of the foremost Catholic writers said last summer, the idea of a purely lay society, acting in the purely material, political and social domain, took more and more distinct form.

Thence arose by degrees the notion of religion as of public utility. The philosophers who in the 18th century exercised so strong and so formative an influence upon the development of modern France were in the main infidels: that is, they were skeptics, adherents of neither the Catholic nor the Protestant Church: but they were nearly a unit in believing that as a branch of the public service the established Church (Catholic) was a necessity. It was the French Revolution, however, with all those outstanding horrors which to the foreign mind—never, however, to the mind of France—obscure the enormous debt which that country owes to it,—it was the Revolution which gave to France its modern conception of society, and which put into legislative form this idea of the public utility of religion.

It performed the act most awkwardly: the atrocities of the Ancient Order, in which, most unhappily and yet inevitably, the Catholic Church had had a share, had so maddened and blinded the common people that they were unable to think of

the Church apart from that doctrine of the divine right to which the agonies of past generations had been due. In the nature of things, indeed, the two were for the time indistinguishable, and it has been the fatal blunder of the Catholic Church in France, clearly recognized by the best minds in that Church, that ever since the Revolution it has identified itself with this doctrine, has made itself a political power, espoused a political party, and sought to stem the current of modern progress by the determined, and as ill-judged as determined, policy of breaking up the Republic and of restoring the Bourbon house, or as a last resort, the Napoleonic dynasty, to the throne of France. To this capital error of judgment must be attributed, in the last analysis, the drastic character of the Associations' law of 1901 and the infractions of true liberty found in the Separation law of 1905.

The Church has always repudiated the principles of the French Revolution, and this is a mistake which the French people cannot forgive.

It is impossible thoroughly to understand the history of France without a vivid realization of the intense allegiance of the French people to the principles of the Revolution. By this standard every man and every measure are tested. This explains the loyalty of the people to a republican form of government. Republican America is far from understanding or appreciating the enthusiasm for the Republic as France feels it.

The Revolution, notwithstanding its desecration of churches, murder of priests, and temporary mad worship of Reason, recognized, then, the value of religion as a branch of the public service. Napoleon I., with his marvellous genius for organization, established the principle upon a foundation which, with one brief interval, stood firm for a hundred years. With personal religion the First Consul had no concern: he would have established Buddhism or Fetishism had either served his purpose. And so, while signing the Concordat with Pius VII., which made the Catholic Church practically the re-

ligion of the State because actually it was the religion of nearly all the citizens, he was careful in the "organic articles" by which the Concordat was enforced, to recognize three other churches as on a parity in civil standing with the Church of Rome, because equally of public utility, as the religions of some French citizens. These were the Jewish Church and the two branches of Protestantism,—Lutheran and Calvinistic,—the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. Subsequently, with the colonial expansion of France, the nature of the organic articles made Islam a State religion without further legislation: but as the Separation Law is not, as yet, applicable to Algeria and the colonies, this fact need not detain us.

There was this difference between three of the "recognized" churches, and the fourth. The Reformed, Lutheran and Jewish Churches were simply ruled by the common law; the Catholic both by this law and by contract between the State and the head of the Church. Out of this distinction has arisen a large proportion of the difficulties and perplexities of the past, and especially of the present, relations between Church and State. There was no political power to enforce the organic articles in the case of the three extra-concordatorial religions, and it was easy for a Roman Catholic monarch to make them nugatory, so far as these religions were concerned: but their common law rights remained intact, though not capable of enforcement, so long as the Concordat prevailed; and conversely, in its abrogation, they are obliged to come under such limitations as the State believes to be essential to self-preservation in the case of the Catholic Church. Being more or less Republican in their organization, they are in harmony with the principles of the Republic and offer it no menace which requires them to be fettered, yet it is impossible to make any exception in their favor, when so limiting the autonomy of the monarchical Catholic Church as to render it innocuous to the State. The Protestant and Jewish churches perfectly understand this condition and recognize its necessity.

The Catholic Church, then, was in a condition of special privilege by reason of the Concordat. On one condition only, however, could this state of privilege remain active: namely, that the French Government and the Pope should continue of one mind. It was because this condition no longer existed that the separation between Church and State has occurred.

Under the First Napoleon there was no friction of moment between France and Apostolic See, because everything had been arranged to the Emperor's mind, and he was too powerful to be opposed. The Pope, indeed, protested strongly against the organic articles, but he did not repudiate the contract, and his protest fell on deaf ears. With the return of the Bourbons, passionately loyal Catholics, the Church had, in some sort, its revenge; and here it made that political blunder of which we see the result. Instead of using royal favor to develop its own liberties, it embraced the reactionary program of the Bourbons, who sought to replace everything as it had been under the Old Régime. To this, the people, who had had a taste of liberty under the First Republic, would not willingly consent, and thus was intensified that disaffection to monarchical institutions and to a hierarchical Church, which after long years culminated in the law of last December.

The monarchy felt the popular reaction much sooner than the Church, which was undisturbed by the Revolution of July and the change to the Orleans Family in 1830. During the brief second Republic, for a few short months the Churches were free of the State, but only to fall again under the Concordat and the organic articles of 1802, when the *coup d'état* made Louis Napoleon emperor.

From 1850 to 1870 the Catholic Church was again in power, the Third Napoleon understanding its usefulness as a weapon of public utility, and the Empress being devoted to it with a loyalty of which the Bourbons knew nothing. Unhappily the Empress did not put herself under the tutelage of the best minds in the Church. Had Lacordaire or Montalembert been Eugénie's spiritual director—they whose

watchword, like that of the Protestant Vinet, was "the Church free in a free State," the conscientious reaction against all religion which nobly expressed itself in the life and writings of a Taine, a Renan, a Victor Hugo, and its worst effects in the murder of the good archbishop Darboy and the fusillading of the French priests under the Commune, would not have been.

It should never be ignored by intelligent thinkers that the wildest excesses of the French Revolution, the most atrocious acts of the Commune, were in their initiative acts of conscience and loyalty,—or rather, the loyal revolt of right-minded men who would no longer tolerate an imposed religion, but whose free thought was not anti-religious in the popular acceptance of the word, met a fearful response in the acts of multitudes maddened by oppression and cheated by a religion which they had come to look upon as an instrument of oppression.

But 1871 was not 1793, and France had learned wisdom. The Commune became the Provisional Republic, and the Catholic Church of France resumed its functions, only, alas! to repeat the mistake of entering the political arena. Tenacious of the doctrine of divine right, and the monarchical theory of government, it has never ceased, from that day to this, to enter actively into Bourbon and Napoleonic intrigues, and later to ally itself with socialistic and anarchistic foes of the existing order.

From the very beginning of things the Gallican Church has always made the mistake of being more catholic than the Pope. The successor of Peter, whatever his name, has found no difficulty with an unestablished Church in America and Great Britain, and made no outcry when a few years ago Brazil disestablished the Church. There are no more brilliant men of letters, no more pious and devoted parish ministers, no more gifted educators, in the Catholic world than among the bishops, cardinals, parish priests and monks of France; but politically, the French hierarchy has blundered from first to last. Had it not meddled after the Franco-

Prussian war the Duke of Orleans would perhaps to-day be king of France. Thiers, the free-thinking President of the Third Republic, regarded his own government as merely provisional, and fully expected to restore the monarchy; Marshal MacMahon, his successor, a thoroughgoing monarchist, would fain have seen Henri V. upon the throne; but the people wanted liberty, wanted a constitution. A word from the confessor of the Count de Chambord would have made him Henri V.: but that word was not spoken: the Church upheld the natural intransigence of the Bourbon: he refused to lay down the white flag and accept the tricolor, the emblem of civil and religious freedom, and the Third Republic became an established fact.

Unfortunately for the people of France they are profoundly aware that the Catholic Church is not, never has been, in accord with the spirit or the fundamental laws of the Republic. This want of conformity vitiates even its religious functions, and gives to all its external activities—education, benevolences,—a quality of struggle, of self-seeking, which makes it a menace to the State by destroying its necessary equilibrium.

Meanwhile, what of Protestantism?

After two centuries of persecution and suppression it was too nearly dead to revive at once when Napoleon I. reaffirmed its existence and nominally freed it from persecution. Under Bourbons and Bonapartes, though it made marvellous spiritual progress, its civil rights were ignored, and so they continued to be for some years after the fall of the Empire. The disabilities and vexatious injustices, little and great, which they suffered were almost innumerable, and in so enlightened a state, incomprehensible. In liberal, republican France in 1873 no Protestant could expect as a matter of course to bury his dead in a consecrated cemetery; the privilege was his only on sufferance, permission being grudgingly granted, perhaps after five, ten, twenty days of incessant siege of the tribunals. Until 1878 it was a state's prison offence to make a convert from any religion to any other. This law had always been a

dead letter in the case of Catholics but not in that of Protestants. It often was and at any time might be enforced where a Catholic went over to Protestantism. Even up to the passage of the Separation law of last December it was an offence punishable with fine and imprisonment to hold religious meetings in any private house, *even with the permission of the proper authorities*. Such laws are unduly restrictive of the rights of man, and especially onerous in the case of a church the very genius of which is social, and which was making marked progress among the poorer peasantry, who yet were unable to provide themselves with religious edifices. Until the passage of the Separation law the State had the right to supervise the doctrines taught in churches, to make sure that they corresponded with the standards deposited with the government. The Bishops have been supported by this law in dealing with their parish priests who have felt the influence of "Americanism" or of the "new movement" of thought in French Catholicism. Père Didon suffered under it a generation ago, and the Abbé Loisy in recent years.

The most intolerant laws were repealed in 1878-1882, but the situation remained a difficult one, more especially in the case of Protestantism.

The law which forbade ecclesiastics to leave their dioceses without permission of the government worked comparatively little injury to Catholics, they being sufficiently numerous for concerted action within their territorial limits, and having a bond of union in the Roman hierarchy. But to the Protestants, thinly scattered over a wide territory—to this day there are departments containing only from one hundred to three hundred Protestants of all ages,—this limitation was fatal to any sense of union as to any concerted action. With no ecclesiastical head, and forbidden to meet in synods or assemblies, each church, each individual in many cases, was left to live—or die—alone. For seventy years, from 1802 to 1872, the Reformed and Lutheran churches had no autonomy, no government, no means of association or of fostering that sense of

unity which is necessary to large activity. Few even of intelligent Protestants knew the constitution of their own Church. Yet in 1818 the Bible Society was founded, in 1822 the Foreign Missionary and Tract Societies, in 1833 the Evangelical Society, to care for the religious weal of the *disséminés*—the scattered Protestants; these societies in the nature of things being conducted chiefly by laymen. In 1844 representatives of all Protestant denominations met in Lyons “to demonstrate and affirm Christian union in all the Churches,” and laid the foundations of a movement which four years later, in London, became the Evangelical Alliance. But while there were many men of intelligence and nobility of character among French Protestants—a Guizot, a Waddington, a Pressensé, a Bersier, a Freycinet—they were too few in number to exercise a marked influence upon the nation.

The political perspicacity by which in 1885 or '86 anti-clerical free thought found in Protestantism a weapon against ultramontane polities certainly strengthened it, if only by making known its existence, entirely ignored in many parts of the country. At this time and for some years longer, the law which required every man's “papers” to show his religious affiliation was still in force, the absence of the “act of baptism” or of circumcision invalidating them, and change from one religion to another being still illegal, although always, as has been said, condoned in the case of a convert to Catholicism. The abrogation of this law, enabling thousands of “non-practicing” Catholics to free themselves from galling bonds, by a natural reaction swelled the ranks of free thought and gave more strength to anti-clericalism; but Francisque Sarey, militantly anti-clerical, urged all such, of whatever shade of indifferentism, to register as Protestants. To a certain extent this counsel was followed. The free-thinking Taine willed to be buried by Protestant rite, rather than by a civil funeral, desiring not only to avoid being ranked among enemies of religion, but chiefly to register in this way his conviction that in Protestantism resided France's best hope of

liberty. Such methods, if widely carried out, would have lowered the tone of the Reformed Church, and the virulent anti-Protestant campaign, by which after the Dreyfus *affaire* the Catholic Church took its reprisals, was rather an advantage to it than otherwise, by awakening the Reformed Church to self-consciousness and a sense of solidarity.

It had been the pride of France that there had never been any "Jewish question" within its territory. The Dreyfus affair changed all that. Into the merits of that affair it is needless to enter, but because of its after effects it is necessary to allude to it here. The *affaire* was an important factor in a desperate attempt to overthrow the Republic and restore the monarchy, an attempt into which the Catholic church unfortunately threw the whole weight of its influence. Then arose that fierce anti-clerical reaction of which Gambetta twenty years before had given the watchword. The mind of the French people had marvellously changed within that period, and now, with fiery indignation it was perceived that the minds not only of the young army officers during their education at St. Cyr, but of all the young, were being systematically poisoned with teachings hostile to the Republic; and Separation of Church and State became inevitable.

The Falloux law, initiated under the Second Republic, but not becoming a law until after the *coup d'état*, had made primary instruction free, that is, not subject to the supervision of the State. It was under the protection of this law that the congregational schools made their great development, gradually covering also the field of secondary education, and finally bringing the majority of the children and youth of France under clerical influence. The reaction against this condition found its ultimate expression in the Associations Law. The Dreyfus affair having turned public attention to this subject, it was discovered that more than three-fifths of all primary and more than two-fifths of all secondary education was being carried on in "congregational" schools, and that the proportion was annually increasing in the rate of eleven to seven. The

Congregations were communities of monks and nuns which had made remarkable growth in France within the last half century, were not included in the Concordat nor were under the authority of the French bishops, but were directly subject to the pope. Their influence and activities were reprobated by the majority of the bishops and the entire body of parish priests—partly no doubt because they were able to divert into their own coffers a large proportion of the contributions that would otherwise have come to the secular clergy. Within a generation the Congregations had enormously increased in numbers, and had grown immensely wealthy, both in landed and personal property. It was not, however, their wealth that first excited popular indignation, but their teachings. Their schools and their text-books, being not subject to government inspection, nor to that of the bishops, were found, when inquired into, to be deliberately false to history, directly subversive of loyalty to the established order, and openly hostile to the State. Especially was this the case with the Assumptionist order, under which cloak the exiled Jesuits—seventy times exiled from various European governments—had returned to France in enormous numbers, and who openly proclaimed their intention to overthrow the Republic and restore the royal or imperial monarchy. To this end their newspaper, *La Croix*, published in Paris, with a local edition in nearly every department of France, and widely circulated under pain of various penalties, was an important adjunct.

Under these conditions M. Waldeck-Rousseau took the power in 1899. He at once resolved to check the very disquieting development of the Congregations. The repeal of the Falloux law, which was an important part of his plan, though it caused immense excitement in France, attracted little attention in foreign countries, being overshadowed by the more picturesque and dramatic interest of the *Law of July 1, 1901*, otherwise known as the Associations Law.

The enactment of this law has wholly done away with the precedent situation. Its immediate effect upon the monks and

nuns has quite obscured the far more important results which French society as a whole has reaped from it. Article 294 of the Penal Code (Napoleon) forbade the existence of any association of more than 23 persons for whatever purpose. The law of July 1 abrogates this article. It removes all restrictions from associations, whatever their number or object, provided this be not contrary to law or good morals. No restriction is laid upon the amount of property held by any association, except that it must all subserve the purpose of the association—for example, no secret fund may be formed for political purposes if the avowed object of the Association is other than political. No public declaration of the existence of the Association is required, nor the filing of any papers, unless it purposes to possess property, real or personal. In this case it must declare its existence, laws, objects, and the names of its administrators—a proceeding practically equivalent to incorporation. Upon this mere declaration an Association acquires civil personality, may acquire or alienate property, and has the right to public justice.

This measure, it must be remembered, with the repeal of the Falloux law, was not the act of a radical government nor an anti-clerical majority. M. Waldeck-Rousseau was a Moderate Republican, and his Cabinet was chiefly composed of Moderates, "practicing" Catholics and loyal to their church. It was, however, the necessary preliminary to disestablishment, since only under its provisions could a church exist as a body of lay persons, its business affairs conducted by lay trustees,—the *associations cultuelles* of the Separation law.

Nor is Separation of Church and State the result of enmity to religion. The introduction of the law of last December was undoubtedly the immediate effect of the melodramatic opposition which the congregations offered to the enforcement of the Associations law, and its passage was conspicuously justified by the pope's breach of the Concordat in summoning two French bishops to Rome without reference to the President of the Republic, and by his ill-advised protest against the President's

Italian visit; but Separation was the inevitable consequence of the establishment of a republican government. More than thirty years ago the far-seeing church historian and life-senator, Edmond de Pressensé, prophesied that the sun of the twentieth century would not rise upon an established Church in France. The prophesy was inaccurate as to date, but its essential fulfilment was in the nature of things.

NEW YORK CITY.

(*To be continued.*)

IV.

THE LAMB IN THE MIDST OF THE THRONE.

BY PROF. JOHN I. SWANDER, D.D.

A philosopher once said, "Among the elements water is the best, among the metals gold outshines all the rest; and when you look for a bright star in the firmament never expect to find one that outshines the sun himself."

So when we seek to bestow our admiration upon the most illustrious and resplendent character in that heavenly world beyond the visible constellations and galaxies of the zodiac we should never expect to find one more fair than the chief among ten thousand and the one altogether lovely.

And I looked and a book was opened. It was the book of *Atheistic Ontology*. The volume had the visible universe for its contents. As some one read in the atheistic dialect of miserable jargon I heard the fool say in his heart "there is no God."

I looked again and saw another book opened. It was the book of *Irreverent Infidelity*. In that book was written, with a spluttering pen: "God is a monster to have created a race of beings, knowing that under their exposure to seductive temptation and hellish hate they would fall into wretchedness and ruin."

I looked again and saw another book. It was the book of *Theological Perplexity*. I read therin: "God was not wise enough to foresee the result of what was potentially involved in his works, and hence was obliged in the way of a benevolent afterthought to switch his creation off onto an infralapsarian side-track"—for repairs. And I saw that much of this miserable stuff was hashed up into modern orthodoxy.

"And I looked again, and saw in the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the back, close

sealed with seven seals. And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a great voice: "Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no one in the heaven or on the earth, or under the earth was able to open the book or to look thereon. And I wept much, because no one was found worthy to open the book, or to look thereon: And one of the elders said unto me, weep not: behold the Lion that is of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath overcome, to open the book and the seven seals thereof. And I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain, and he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat on the throne."

No wonder that the twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb and sung a new song, saying "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood"!

That book was "written first within" and also on the back, implying the necessity of revelation first from the inside in order to penetration from the outside. Hence divine revelation conditions human discovery, divine evolution conditions human solution, and the Incarnation of the Son of God conditions the inspiration of the sons of men.

That Lamb stood in the midst of the throne. His standing, rather than a sitting or reclining posture indicates not only his eternal yesterday, to-day and forever, but also his activity in history, and the positive progress of history down the aisle of the ages. "In the volume of the book it is written of me. Lo! I come to do thy will, oh God."

I saw a Lamb, as it had been slain, or as though it had been slain; either on Calvary to ransom ruined man, or from the foundation of the world in the purpose of God. There is truth and force in either construction, but more truth and force in the complemental union of the two. Let no man put asunder the inseparable actualizations of that stupendous whole which God hath ordained to run through all the ages,

and all the ages to come, until it reaches its final consummation in that "far away divine event toward which the whole creation moves."

It would not fall within the scope of our present purpose to tarry with the four beasts round about the throne, as we do not know their significance in that connection; nor to pause among the four and twenty elders, except to note that they were elders (*presbuteroi*), not bishops (*episcopoi*) (as the house of bishops had not yet arrived); but to note and emphasize the fact that the Lamb was *in the midst of the throne*.

The Lamb stands in the midst of the throne—not a suppliant before the throne, not a mere power behind the throne, not an heir apparent to the throne, neither an infralapsarian appendage to the throne. The throne is Christocentric, and all correct thinking thereof must be Christologic. The moral universe must own the transcendency and the immanency as well as the preexistence of our Christ. He is in the world and the world was made by Him. He is constructively and reconstructively present. The government of the world is upon his shoulders. He is the principle of progress in the world's historic onflow; and will so continue to unfold the eternal purpose, until He that sits on the throne and holds the Mysterious book in his right hand shall "be all and in all."

Some of us may lack both the ability and disposition of certain advanced thinkers to see in the Man of Gallilee the eternal humanity of Christ, yet none of us should fail to see the eternal God in the son of Mary, as well as the humanity of man in the incarnate God.

The most ecumenical symbol of the Reformed Church is correct in its teaching that we are so far depraved as to be wholly unapt to any good and prone to all evil, unless we are born again by the Spirit of God; and yet the truth is read between the lines, if not in the lines, that human nature is not so depraved as to be incapable of receiving the *highest* good when overshadowed by the power of the Highest. Total depravity does not imply radical depravity. While we deplore the con-

sequences of the awful catastrophe of the fall, we take delight in the fact that humanity has neither been neutralized, demonized nor brutalized. Hence the assumption of humanity by the Son of God was not in itself a humiliation, but the first act in the drama of his theanthropic glorification.

The foregoing view assumes with Leibner and others that the Son of God would have become the son of man even though man had not sinned. But man having sinned, and thereby having necessitated the shedding of Messianic blood, the assumption of humanity by the Son of God drew after it the additional necessity of subjection and humiliation even unto the death of the cross. Hence the Lamb was seen in the midst of the throne "as it had been slain."

Sin and death came into the world neither by necessity nor accident, but by the unfolding of a possibility originally involved in the charter of human freedom and human dignity. It is assumed therefore, that He who ordained such way of attaining such freedom and dignity ordained also a throne high enough and broad enough to become a throne of Grace in the event of such sad actualization in history. Yet Immanuel's mission in the world was compleutive as well as restorative. There were seven seals to God's great book, and the Lamb in the midst of the throne was worthy to open them all.

That is a very inadequate view of Christ's mission into the world which sees in it a purpose no broader than the summit of Mt. Calvary. Seeing its soteriological purpose, we should both emphasize and glory in the cross. Yet Christ was not primarily born to die. He was born to live, and to give testimony to the truth in a sense much broader than Pilate's judgment hall. His mission was to give life to the world and to give it more abundantly; but when sin threw the cross athwart His philanthropic path He drank the dregs of its bitter cup. "He saved others; Himself he could not save" except by paying the ransom involved in His assumption of our humanity.

The position of much modern orthodoxy is the very counterpoint of the position of the disciples on their way to Emmaus.

Under their view the Messianic mission was to be completed without the cross. Under the traditional view the tragedy of Golgotha was the last act in the drama of the world's redemption, and the closing scene of all that the incarnation involved. At this point the Lamb in the midst of the throne steps in between these two counterpoints exclaiming: "Oh foolish men and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His Glory?" Christ's entrance into the glorified state gave Him the power to open the book. Never before could He say in that same sense: "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth." Whatever may have been his prerogatives and powers before His incarnation, or during His state of humiliation in the flesh, He is now "the Lion that is of the tribe of Judah," and the Lamb in the midst of the throne. Henceforth we know Him no more after the flesh. The heavenly gates stood open to receive Him; the everlasting doors gave way, and He took His place as never before in the midst of the throne as the Lamb in meekness and the Lion in strength. He not only holds the keys of death and hell, but is Himself the key that unlocks all the mysteries of Providence. He is the key to the world's great history. He is in history, and the theology that does not reckon with Him as the central person and principle thereof had better retire before the rising sun of His Christocentric kingdom, power and glory. He is in the midst of the throne. That throne is not limited to a mere pivotal point in space, but extends through the entire realm of His moral universe in which, and in every part of which He is head over all things for the Church.

During the last eighteen centuries there has been eighteen hundred years of Epiphany. From the midst of the throne Christ has been manifesting himself unto the world, and this Epiphany season must run through the entire calendar of the church to the end of time until time shall be no more. His presence in the history of the church is the fountain of an influence that must continue to flow on until it redresses the

miseries which have afflicted every station, age and country and gives reality to that golden dream which has lived through all the consecrated traditions of the past and which continues to breathe hope into all the inspired imaginations of the future. The Lamb is in the midst of the throne.

What changes have been wrought in the earth by the onflow of Christian history! Turning and overturning has been the order and the disorder of the ages. Nations have perished from the earth, and new empires have risen upon their ruins. Kingdoms and Republics have sprung into being where monarchies once tottered and tumbled from the pedestals of their ephemeral power. Potentates have climbed to the pinnacle of fame only to fall into the dust of oblivion. Dynasties have been swept away by the tides of revolution. Cities have been razed to their foundations to make room for the greater metropoles of progress. And yet, upon its firm foundation remains the city whose builder and maker is God, because the Lamb is in the midst of the throne, yesterday, to-day and forever.

The broad historian sees two tides of emigration pouring into Europe and watches them in their collisions, conquests and amalgamations. He sees one tide flowing into Southern Europe founding Rome, annihilating the Carthaginian power, conquering Greece, shattering the monarchies of the East and sitting as the ephemeral mistress of the world; driving back the Goths and vandals that dared to thunder at her imperial gates; sowing the seeds of her civilization in Britain, Gaul and Hispaniola; preserving the most valuable records of revelation and literature; plunging into the sluggish river of the dark ages and emerging with her strength measurably exhausted; discovering the world's last continent under the glory of America's rising sun, until it pours the degenerated energy of its exhausted receiver into the old empires of the Toltecs and the Montezumian halls of the South. It was drifting away from its original moorings into an ecclesiastic forgetfulness that the Lamb is in the midst of the throne.

The intelligent historian also takes a bird's-eye view of the other migratory tide which may be regarded as an overflow of the stalwart barbarism of the orient. The head-waters of its principal current is north of the Alps and it follows the star of its empire westward in its course. Whether we call it Slavonic, Teutonic, Germanic, Saxon, Anglo-Saxon or Celt, it has been for nearly two thousand years the main stream of the world's energy, and for more than a dozen centuries the budding promise of its higher civilization. It rebuked the proud pretensions of the imperial mistress; it reaped the ripest fruit of Latin toil and triumph; it planted and patronized the first universities of learning; it moulded the political destinies of Europe; it gave us *Magna Charta* at Runnymede; it invented the printing press, translated the bible and is now reproducing the Word of God in every vernacular of the world; it fought the battle and gained the victory in the great conflict between the Crescent and the Cross; it drove the Mohammedian Anti-Christ out of Europe, and still keeps him cooped up within the precincts of semi-civilization; it reformed the theology and morals of churchanity, furnished the best martyrs for the cause of eternal truth and the bravest exiles for the sacred right of enlightened conscience; it launched the *Mayflower* of the Pilgrim fathers and planted its most vigorous colonies in the land of William Penn; it founded the noblest institutions of this country, and proclaimed liberty throughout the land and unto all the inhabitants thereof, because the drift of its religion has been toward a more full recognition of the Lamb in the midst of the throne.

That Southern or Latin stream of Christian civilization was never entirely disparted from its fountain head. However stagnant its waters, or sluggish its current, the stream moved on in the heaven-ordained channel of history; but the tendency to limit the Lamb's power in the midst of the throne so culminated in an earthly viceregency as to clog the channel with papal floodwood, and dam the stream with similar stuff, until the reformation of the sixteenth century became a necessity in

the history of the world. This necessity became also the opportunity for the Northern stream of Christian civilization and progress to push forward its higher mission, until, in the sweep of its conquests, it shall be able to lay a ransomed world at the feet of the Lamb in the midst of the everlasting throne.

Among the encouraging signs of the times is the fact that there is a growing disposition in Protestant Christendom to inquire diligently, as did the wise men of old, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" "Back to Christ" is now the watchword of men crying in the wilderness. But whither? To the book, or to the Lamb in the midst of the throne, with power to open the book? "The mighty trend and serious drift away from the Church of Christ in the Protestant world" is to be accounted for, not so much by the existing widespread "loss of faith in the authority of the Scriptures," as by the growing failure to recognize the mission of the Lamb in the midst of the throne. It was not the book, but the Lamb with the book in his hand, who, by his power to open the book, sent a thrill of hope and joy through the exultant hosts of heaven. Because men are without faith in the ever-enthroned and ever-historic Christ, they fail to believe the Bible. From such its inspiring contents are hid. For such there is no one to open the seven seals. Back to Christ's person in the midst of the throne!

Some of the less dangerous heretics of the Anti-Nicean age were more interested than are many of the champions of modern orthodoxy in questions pertaining to the constitution of Christ's person, his relation to the Father, the procession of the Paraclete and His relation to Himself in the hypostatic mystery. It is not intimated that they were more sound in faith, but that they were more earnest in their efforts to know the author and finisher of the faith, and more diligent in their inquiries as to what that faith really involved. And may it not be said in all charity and justice that many of them served in the Providence of God as at least negative magnets in the attraction of truth from the upper clouds, and the

conduction of its vital currents into the ecumenical creeds of the Christian Church?

The Lamb in the midst of the throne is the vital gem of the faith once delivered to the Apostolic saints, defended by the Apostolic fathers, and accentuated by their Apostolic successors until it came flashing its superlative brilliancy down the ages in the truly Christocentric and Christologic creeds of Christendom. From Polycarp to Justin Martyr, from Justin to Athanasius, what a Christocentric cloud of faithful witnesses look down upon us from the heavenly world. The Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedon will continue to make their centuries memorable in the history and hopes of the church as long as the Lamb remains in the midst of the throne.

After Chalcedon, 451, and especially after the settling or unsettling of the Monothelitic controversy in the seventh century there was, seemingly at least, a decadence of the Church's interest in the nature and centrality of Christ's person. The orthodox doctrine was, of course, retained and transmitted in the Ancient Creeds; but other questions, frequently growing out of the question of the Primacy, occupied the center of the ecclesiastical stage. Especially was this the case during the scholastic or dialectic period. It seems that for nearly a thousand years there was no proper recognition of either a Celestial throne or a Lamb in the midst of the throne. The person of the virgin mother was thrust either into or upon the throne of heavenly intercession.

It was this unwarranted assumption on the part of the Romish hierarchy and its incorporation into the cultus of the Catholic Church that helped to ripen the necessity for a reformation. With the sixteenth century came also the dawning of a Christologic consciousness that there was no need for the modification of the one mediatorship between God and man. The Swiss reformer may not have been the first to denounce this approach toward idolatry, yet the Shepherd boy of Wildhaus seems to have been second to none among the reformers

to decry the evil in a public address at Einseidlin in 1517. Seeing the people making their pilgrimages to the image of Mary he preached that prayer should be offered only to the Lamb in the midst of the throne. Indeed some of the Swiss reformers were so impatient in their zeal for the one mediator as to become almost sacrilegiously religious in their radical iconoclasm.

Nearly one-half a century after Zwingli had insisted that the Lamb should be worshiped as occupying all the room in the midst of the mediatorial throne the principle for which he then and thus contended was incorporated in the most ecumenical and irenical symbol that a Protestant Christendom ever produced. This principle interlines the entire Heidelberg Confession, and is heroically expressed in the thirtieth question: "Those who seek their salvation and welfare of saints, although they may make their boasts of Him, yet in act deny the only Savior, Jesus." This position is consistent with the Christological constitution of the book throughout. It is consistent with the anthropological position of the Confession as taken in the first question that the believer in body and soul, in life and death, belongs to his faithful Savior, Jesus Christ. It is consistent with the soteriology of the Confession which teaches in question eighteen that our Lord, Jesus Christ, is freely given unto us for complete redemption and righteousness. It is consistent with the ecclesiological position of the Confession which teaches in question fifty-four "That the Son of God, by His Spirit and word, gathers, defends and preserves for Himself, unto everlasting life, a chosen communion in the unity of the true faith." It is also consistent with the Eschatological position of the Symbol which teaches in question fifty-seven "That not only my soul, after this life, shall be immediately taken up to Christ, its head; but also that this, my body, raised by the power of Christ, shall again be united with my soul and made like unto His glorious body."

For the reasons just assigned and emphasized in the foregoing paragraph, the Heidelberg Confession is for us the royal

gateway to the whole field of Christian Dogmatics. This does not necessarily imply that the Confession is superior in all respects to all others; but for the following three sufficient reasons it is, next to the Bible, the Reformed professor's textbook in Systematic Theology, viz.: (1) Reformed ministers and Reformed professors of theology are solemnly pledged by all the sanctity of their ordination and inauguration vows to search for, view and teach the truth from the standpoint of the Symbol which they are sworn to hold aloft as the subordinate standard of denominational orthodoxy. (2) Because the Symbol is the most ecumenical, irenical and broad of all Confessions produced during and since the Reformation period. (3) Because it is grounded in the genuine catholicity of "the faith once delivered to the saints" and moves along on a line parallel with the teachings of the Apostles' Creed as that was received and interpreted by the Protestantism of the sixteenth century.

It may be true, as claimed by some, that the Heidelberg Confession was strained in its construction of divergency from the historical order of the Apostles' Creed. "We will not say," says Dr. Nevin, "that it is fully answerable in all respects to the genius of the Creed, or that the Creed finds in it everywhere its natural sense and right exposition. We can easily enough see, that a theological interest is allowed at times to bend the symbol from its true course, as in the arbitrary gloss, for example, on the descent to hades, adopted in the forty-fourth question." It is also claimed that the symbol was given too much of an Anselmic turn touching God's method of having satisfaction made for sin. Indeed it may be said that there is a growing Christian sentiment that the Confession is in several respects at variance with the progressive Christological consciousness of the present age.

Assuming that there is truth in the foregoing claims, what are we going to do about it? There is no good reason for attempting anything in a radical way. Rational theologians recognize the fact that we are living in an age productive of

both progress and Christian charity. Even though the Confession be lame in some of its venerable joints, it is still sane and sound in its broad and liberal spirit. As long as the Reformed Church is animated and actuated by that spirit, there will be no need of postponing the dawn of the Millennial day. As long as she doubles her membership every quarter of a century the catechism can afford to wait for the Lord's set time to favor Zion with such a modification of the Symbol as may be necessary to place it in line with modern Christian progress. The Lamb is in the midst of the throne.

Any intimation that the Reformed Church has the right to revise or modify her confession of faith may be met with a counter suggestion that she seriously consider her concomitant right to not undertake any such revisional work before the fulness of the time has been made obviously manifest to her most mature and intelligent judgment. And even then, any such decision to revise would not be justified in the spirit of entire independency of the more general consensus of theological sentiment intelligently prevailing throughout the entire range of progressive Christendom. Although the Heidelberg Confession was not the production of an ecumenical council, it soon came to possess a somewhat ecumenical character in the Protestant Christian world. Viewing the symbol in such character, the wisdom of the Reformed Church will not make undue haste to tamper with the little book in a revisionary way with no regard to the growing and prevailing theological mind of the Church at large. The aim will be to comprehend the truth "with all saints." The Lamb is in the midst of the throne for the special benefit of no mere province in His vast and expansive moral empire. The great white throne is broader than any denomination, no matter how historically central in Protestantism, or superlatively majestic among the sects of the earth.

TIFFIN, OHIO.

V.

HADES.

BY THE REV. HIRAM KING, D.D.

PART I.: HADES AS A STATE OF MAN'S EXISTENCE.

As Hades is the subject of revelation itself for the enlightenment of faith concerning the future existence, there certainly can be no apology needed for its proper discussion, although it is almost wholly ignored in denominational creedal statement and also, to some extent, eliminated from the unsectarian doctrinal formulary of the Apostles' Creed itself.

The Origin of Hades.—The natural life is only the grub stage of man's existence and, under normal conditions, men would doubtless evolve into a glorified state. Of such sublimation of the natural life the translation of Enoch (Heb. 11: 5) and the prophet Elijah (2 Kings 2: 11) are, in fact, exemplifications. Death, however, intervenes between the inception of man's life and its glorification. St. Paul significantly depicts the destroyer under portraiture of a scorpion with sin for his sting (1 Cor. 15: 55, 56). This deadly beast sprang from the fall of man (Gen. 2: 17) and the venom of his sting produces the mortality of all the race at the fountain of life (1 Cor. 15: 22). Man accordingly breaks down in nature instead of surmounting his initial environments. Instead of his glorification in the heavenly state by normal development he disappears "under the earth" (Phil. 2: 10) in physical collapse.

As, now, Hades is an abnormal state of existence, it is plain that God is not its author. Such a state for man could not have been contemplated in his creation because it is foreign to his being. Indeed, Hades as a state involves man's partial destruction and can exist only in the loss of his bodily life. The inauguration of Hades was therefore due, not to divine agency but to the murder of Abel.

Hades Revealed.—Hades is quite a prominent feature of revelation. Under its Hebrew name of Sheol it occurs frequently in the Old Testament Scriptures and is variously translated in the Authorized Version as “hell,” “grave” and “pit.”

The dogma concerning man’s existence in the middle state received its first recorded utterance from Jacob who declared his purpose of going down to Sheol to Joseph mourning (Gen. 37: 35). It is quite plain that the grief-stricken patriarch did not speak of simple death and literal burial, since he believed the story concocted by the conspirators, that his favorite son had been devoured by an evil beast (Gen. 37: 20) and that his bloody coat bore mute testimony to his tragic fate (ver. 32). Thinking him eaten by a wild beast, he certainly could not have referred to him as literally in the grave. If, however, so early an expression of faith in the doctrine of the middle state should be looked upon as having little or no significance, it must still be conceded that this tenet in the Hebrew religious creed receives the unmistakable sanction of revelation in the Hebrew prophets and the Psalms (Isa. 14: 9; Eze. 32: 17-32; Ps. 18: 5).

The revelation of the middle state is not only continued in the New Testament under its Greek name of Hades and its equivalents, but it comes to clearer expression in the New Testament writings than in those of the Old. Thus it was in Hades that the Rich Man appealed to Abraham for relief from suffering (Luke 16: 23-31) and in which the soul of the Lord was not to be left (Acts 2: 27). They were the keys of death and of Hades which the Lord carried away at His resurrection (Rev. 1: 18). It is Hades that will follow death on a limited mission of destruction (6: 8). They are death and Hades which will give up the dead and be cast into the lake of fire (20: 13, 14).

Hades the Mutilation of Man.—The middle state involves not merely the suspension of the bodily functions but the prostration of the bodily constitution itself. Man’s being is

tripartite (1 Thes. 5: 23; Heb. 4: 12) and his trichotomy is essential to his complete existence in any sphere. Death disrupts the complex unity of body, soul and spirit in the destruction of the physical constitution. As the body is thus bereft of its constituent principle of life, its elements dissolve and seek their affinities in earth and air. As the soul, moreover, is the link between body and spirit, it, too, ceases to exist with the disruption of the trichotomic unity. The spirit alone survives the tragic ending of the natural life and tenants Hades. Verily the "image of God" is not just marred in death but broken. Man is a fragment of himself—a single part of his trichotomic being.

Hades obtains, therefore, in the elimination of the body and soul from the constituent unity of man's being and his existence is but partial. He "sleeps" in Christ or else the nightmare of anticipated judgment haunts him in the darkness. The night-time of Hades corresponds not, however, to the night of nature. Nor is the sleep of the dead identical with the nocturnal repose of the living. The sleep of the living follows the exhaustion of the vital forces; that of the dead results from the disintegration of the vital constitution. The sleep of the living is periodical; that of the dead, being the middle state itself, will not be broken before the world's Easter Day. The sleep of the living suspends the mental function; the sleep of the dead debars not mental action (Luke 16: 23-31).

Hades a Sphere of Spiritual Growth.—Notwithstanding man's partial destruction through death, Hades is still an advance on the natural life, from a purely spiritual standpoint, because it affords enlarged freedom for spiritual development. The righteous dead are, on the one hand, no longer exposed to the seductions of the "world, the flesh and the devil" because the general law of sin in the "members" (Rom. 7: 23) is eliminated from their existence by the destruction of the body. On the other hand, they are in higher, holier and richer grace-bearing environments than the living because, being disembodied spirits, they are in more intimate relationship with

God who is a Spirit. For them, moreover, the "communion of saints" with patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and the rest of the pious dead must be blessed quite beyond the experience of the living. While Hades, therefore, still belongs to the unglorified state of man's existence and falls inconceivably short of the heavenly state proper, to which it temporarily bars the way, it is, nevertheless, a stage in the spiritual exaltation of man quite above the natural life.

Hades a State of Happiness or Misery.—The middle state is the preliminary theatre of future recompense or penalty, according to the character of the preceding life. Indeed the Lord Himself not only discloses to the living the general realm of existence in the immediate future (Luke 16: 19-31) and designates it as Hades (ver. 23) but He also makes the *condition* of its tenants the subject of direct revelation (ver. 25). The actors in the drama of The Rich Man and Lazarus are in possession of their normal faculties and the fate or fortune of each is an exemplification of the teaching of revealed religion, that the future weal or woe of men is consequent on the character of their present lives. The chief figure is Abraham, who thoroughly commands the situation and presides over the scene. The dead Epicurean, so lately in princely estate, is told that his present anguish is due to his selfish use of the "good things" he received in his life-time, and that he is, moreover, debarred from the relief he craves by a "great gulf" fixed between them to prevent their intercourse (ver. 26). The late forlorn sufferer from the "evil things" of privation and in infliction appears, however, in the full festal enjoyment of Paradise, "faring sumptuously" in consolatory compensation.

Hades Embraced in the Kingdom of God.—The middle state is a realm of the kingdom of heaven established in the incarnation, and Christ reigns over the dead as well as over the living. As to the scope of the Lord's jurisdiction in His exaltation, St. Paul wrote to the Philippians "that in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and

things on earth and things under the earth" (2: 10). The proverbial expression, "under the earth," is the equivalent of Hades but the "things" under the earth could not possibly be the bodies in the grave, since the latter are inanimate and therefore plainly incapable of performing the act of homage attributed to the former. Clearly, then, the newly-crowned King extends His sceptre also to the realm of disembodied spirits and the righteous dead "bow the knee" before Him in true allegiance as well as His living subjects.

The reign of Christ over Hades implies, however, much more than the happiness and safety of His "sleeping" subjects. The inference is warranted that their active interest is constantly enlisted in the progress of His Kingdom. Citizenship is functional and implies active service.

Hades not a Final State.—The middle state is, in the nature of the case, temporary and will be brought to an end at the conclusion of the personal reign of Christ. As the Lord secured the keys of death and of Hades at His resurrection (Rev. 1: 18), He controls egress from the great prison and will throw open its mighty portal, at His second advent, for the release of its inmates (1 Cor. 15: 22). The great enlargement will not take place, however, in the literal opening of a prison-gate but in a general resurrection of the dead which will be the eventual climax of the reign of Christ and His ultimate triumph over the destroyer of man's life. This reassertion of the supremacy of life will, moreover, not only be universal, but also final, the attendant result necessarily being the destruction of death and Hades for want of mortal men.

The End of Hades.—That the termination of the middle state will be consequent on the general resurrection is self-evident, but the resurrection itself is clothed in diverse prophetic figures. Thus the dead shall be raised at the sound of a trumpet (1 Cor. 15: 52), they shall awake from sleep in the dust (Dan. 12: 2) and the cemeteries are fields upon which the natural body is sown, in sepulture, for the spiritual harvest of the resurrection (1 Cor. 15: 44). It is certain, however,

that the general resurrection will not be the stupendous miracle to be wrought, in the popular mind, at blast of trumpet or vocal summons of God. The resurrection will, on the contrary, be due to the impulse of life. As Christ is the "resurrection and the life" (John 11: 25) because He became the progenitorial Head of the race in the incarnation (1 Cor. 15: 45), it is plain that the resurrection of the dead at the "last day" (John 11: 24) will be due to the inherent immortality of the incarnate race-life itself, just as was His own resurrection at Easter.

The affirmation that the resurrection of the body will result from the impulse of life itself is fully warranted by St. Paul's agricultural simile, that the seed-grain is *quickened* through its death for its growth into the harvest (1 Cor. 15: 36-38). So, too, the seed-grain of the body is "quickened" through death, the earth will be reaped at the time of harvest (Rev. 14: 16) and the middle state will cease to exist.

It is not in Adam, however, that man will surmount the abnormal condition of Hades. Adam is the generic head of the race and it is in him that their upward progress is arrested, since "all die" through generative heredity from him (1 Cor. 15: 22). It is, therefore, quite plain that man is totally disqualified at the fountain of his life for spiritual evolution from his initial state.

Man will, on the contrary, reach his delayed destiny in the glorified state through spiritual birth of the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15: 45) in whose person human nature is sublimated into a higher immortality than that which was lost in the fall. It will be under impulse of man's *theanthropic* life that the "sleepers" in the dust will awake in the morning of the world's Easter to nightless existence on the "new earth" (Isa. 65: 17). The grain of the body that is sown "under the earth" is cast also into the soil of the new creation and will therefore spring up on the sun-lit field of the general resurrection.

PART II.: THE DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO HADES.

The Descent of Christ in the Creed.—The Apostles' Creed is the summary of divine revelation from the beginning of man's existence in the world to his glorification in heaven. It is, moreover, the presentation of the main facts of revelation in the order of their sequence. This greatest of the religious creeds is therefore the truly historical statement of the doctrines of the Gospel and necessarily includes the article of the descent of Christ into Hades, since it marks a distinct stage in the progress of revelation. The instinct was accordingly correct which prompted the Church from the first to attach significance for faith to the period in the Lord's advent between Good Friday and Easter Sunday.

The Descent of Christ Logical.—The incarnation, in the nature of the case, made the descent of Christ into Hades inevitable. The advent is not the sham of a Docetic phantasm but the assumption of human nature by the Second Person of the Trinity in essence, attribute and function (John 1: 14). The incarnation is accordingly quite as much human as divine. The Son of God, "come in the flesh" (1 John 4: 2), is also the Son of Man (Matt. 8: 20) and is therefore within human environments and subject to the conditions of human existence. As, now, the fall of man made his natural death unavoidable, it is perfectly plain that the identification of Christ with the race in His birth involved Him in the common destruction of the natural life and the general descent into Hades.

The Descent of Christ in Revelation.—The descent of Christ into Hades is, moreover, affirmed as distinctly in revelation as it is demonstrated by logic. Thus King David, in foretelling the resurrection of Christ, said "that neither was He left in Hades" (Acts 2: 31). The Lord assured His penitent fellow-sufferer on Good Friday that He would be with Him in Paradise the same day (Luke 23: 43). Although Hades and Paradise are not equivalent terms, they

both refer to man's existence in death. David spoke of Hades as a state and therefore used its general designation. The Lord, however, assumed the moral distinction of the dead and employed the specific term, Paradise, to designate the felicitous condition of the righteous in Hades with whom He classed the petitioner. He exemplified, in part, the well-known doctrine of the Jews concerning existence in the immediate future (He had done so fully in the parable of The Rich Man and Lazarus) that Sheol was divided into two compartments; the one, at a relative elevation, for the habitation of the righteous; the other, at a lower level, for the incarceration of the wicked. The former was called Paradise; the latter Gehenna.

The Descent of Christ His Self-revelation to the Dead.—The descent of Christ into Hades extended His first advent into the realm of the dead. The death of Christ, like the death of mere men, was the separation of body and soul, but it was not the dissolution of His theanthropic person. The incarnation was neither annulled on the cross nor held in suspense from Good Friday to Easter. The union of God and man in the person of Christ is *spiritual* in its fundamental aspect and could not be broken in the wreck of His *physical constitution*. The descent of Christ into Hades, with any real significance, would, in fact, have been impossible if His death had involved the dissolution of His theanthropic person, since His necessary identification with the fortunes of the race is wholly dependent on the permanent union of His two natures.

As Christ therefore descended into Hades in His incarnate identity, it is plain that His ingress there was His self-revelation to the dead. He accordingly challenged the faith of the dead in His descent to them as really as He challenged the faith of the living prior to His death.

The Recognition of the Lord by the Dead.—Personal faith, it is plain, survives the termination of the natural life and the Old Testament saints "slept with their fathers," trusting in the covenant assurances of the Messianic advent. Did they,

then, recognize the Messianic character of Christ at His appearance among them?

The question of the attitude of the dead toward Christ will be simplified by first ascertaining the cause of His rejection by the living. It is plain that the Jews did not reject Christ for lack of personal faith in the Messianic promise, since their Messianic hope was really their national inspiration. The Jewish race was indeed the historical incarnation of the Messianic idea which expressed itself in their religious system, moulded their character and made them a peculiar people. It became their national genius and rendered their race-identity indestructible. It placed their "golden age" in *prospect* and gave them the attitude of *expectancy*.

It was therefore the *faith* of the Jews that furnished the motive for their unique crime. They rejected Christ *because* they expected the Messiah. Their persistent homicidal attitude toward Him resulted from the *intensity* of their belief in the Messianic advent.

The seeming perversity of the Jews in rejecting the Messiah, although their faith in the Messianic promise was their master-passion, can, however, be accounted for on perfectly rational grounds. In later Judaism, it is well-known, Messianic promise was diverted from its spiritual bearings to national aspirations, and faith in the Messianic advent became *materialistic*. The popular expectation, at the appearance of Christ, was therefore for a *political* Messiah who should overthrow the Roman power in Palestine and restore the Jewish commonwealth to its traditional splendor under King David. It was plainly in consequence of this total *misconception* of the Messiah's character that "they that were his own received him not" (John 1: 11) at His advent, and it was but an exemplification of the law of cause and effect that, under power of a faith thus perverted, they crucified Him instead of crowning Him. Their faith, like a misdirected physical force, had become an engine of destruction instead of a benificent power,

and the challenge of such believers by the true Messiah must necessarily have resulted in the crowning tragedy of history.

It is self-evident that the attitude of the dead toward Christ at His descent into Hades, like the attitude of the living toward Him in His ministry, depended on the *character* of their faith in the Messianic advent. Was then the faith of the dead, like the faith of the living, corrupted and practically diverted from its object? and did they, like their living co-religionists, look for a phantom Messiah? No, since the faith of the righteous dead must have been truly Messianic and could not therefore have been misdirected at the advent of the Messiah. The faith of the living was *originally* spiritual and it was only in later times that it became secularized. Abraham was ancestral for faith (Gal. 3: 7) as well as for the Jewish race and his personal faith was so purely Messianic that he "saw" the "day" of Christ some eighteen centuries in the future. Many generations, also, of true believers died before the faith of the visible Church became corrupt and the assumption is warranted that their faith did not afterwards lose its purity, since death eliminates from the existence the corrupting influences of the world.

Then again, revelation among the dead is not only unhindered by the worldly obstructions peculiar to the visible Church, but it comes to clearer expression among the dead than among the living. As to mode, revelation among the dead is not made through the *writings* of inspired men but by their *speech*. The divine communications to the dead are not made by means of ancient documents whose purport is not uniformly clear and which have been exposed to both mutilation and interpolation. But God makes His revelation in the middle state "by the mouth of His holy prophets which have been since the world began." His former ambassadors to the living are His present *authenticators* of revelation to the dead. As they were, moreover, the *bearers* of revelation to the living, they are its *undisputed* authorities among the dead.

It would therefore seem that the dogmatic misconceptions of the visible Church, which are so detrimental to faith, are, in the nature of the case, eliminated from the creed of the invisible Church.

The descent of Christ into Hades was itself, moreover, an article in the creed of the invisible Church, prior to His death, quite as much as His advent to the living was an article in the creed of the visible Church, prior to His birth. The *Suffering Messiah* was indeed portrayed very distinctly in both Old Testament typology and prophecy. Thus the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement and the lamb for the Passover both implied the *death* of Christ and were its annual prefiguration. Whatever, too, may be the exegetical fancies of modern critics concerning the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, it still remains that the Jewish interpreters affirmed the Messianic character of that prophecy prior to the crucifixion of Christ, and that they gave it a national application only subsequently to its fulfillment at Calvary, with the evident purpose of justifying their unbelief. The conclusion is reasonable, moreover, that the original interpretation of the prophecy, to the effect that the Messiah should be slain for the world He would save, is correct, since it was plainly in consequence of the perversion of the Messianic faith that the later Jewish commentators diverted the reference of the prophetic utterance from the Jewish Messiah to the Jewish people.

The descent of Christ into Hades was not, however, as the flash of a meteor out of the darkness, but as the coming of the day whose dawn proclaims its advent. Indeed, the descent of Christ to the dead would seem to have been more fully heralded than His advent to the living. That the believing dead even had knowledge of His presence in Palestine prior to His death is scarcely doubtful. But how could the dead receive intelligence of the advent of Christ before His descent to them? it may be asked. Possibly the shepherds to whom an angel announced His birth had already died and communicated his advent to the dead. It is certain that the aged

Simeon and Anna who had recognized Him at His presentation had died. There can be no reasonable doubt, moreover, that the recently martyred Baptist had made known to the expectant dead the appearance in Judea of one upon whom, at His baptismal consecration by himself, he had seen the Holy Spirit descending in Messianic designation (John 1: 33), and that His subsequent works had proclaimed His Messianic character. It is reasonable, too, that Malachi should have identified the dead Baptist as the "messenger" who should clear the way for the Messiah's approach (3: 1) and that Isaiah should have recognized in Him the "voice" that should demand of the people His becoming reception (40: 3). That both these prophets recognized the victim to Herodias' revenge and declared Him to have been appointed through their own prophetic utterances to the office of introducing the Messiah to the Jews, there can be but little doubt. Surely one may believe that the mission of John was not confined to the living but that he bade also the believing dead to "Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

It must now be evident that the invisible Church *possessed* the knowledge of the Messiah's character which the visible Church lacked through worldly perversion, and that, therefore, the descent of Christ into Hades was more intelligently anticipated by the dead than His advent was by the living. The inference is accordingly warranted that the *recognition* of His Messianic character which had been denied the Lord by the living was accorded Him spontaneously by the dead.

*The Significance of the Descent of Christ for the Unrighteous Dead.**—The first advent is the era of *evangelization*. In the preaching of the Gospel men are not challenged to believe in the Messianic idea but in the Messiah. Reeking altar, offering for sin, sprinkling hysop and paschal celebration be-

* That the descent of Christ into Hades was His advent to the *believing* dead as well as the occasion of His evangelistic mission to the formerly "disobedient," might be assumed with entire confidence. But the assurance of Christ to His believing fellow-sufferer at Calvary that he would be with Him in Paradise is a demonstration of His true communion with the saints in the middle state.

came cherished memories at the supersedure of all Hebrew ceremonial in the Messianic self-offering, and revelation is now *personal*. The Holy Evangel is, in fact, the Crucified Christ Himself (1 Cor. 2: 2).

Man's death, as well as his life, is within the period of the first advent, the era of evangelization. Christ in His descent into Hades therefore challenged the faith of the dead as much as He challenged the faith of the living in His birth. Such at all events is the conclusion of reason. Is it also the affirmation of revelation? With exegetical freedom from dogmatical embarrassment, it would seem to be.

The noted declaration by St. Peter that Christ "went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Peter 3: 19) implies the extension of the first advent, *as the era of evangelization*, into the realm of the dead because: (1) The Lord's evangelistic mission to "the spirits in prison" coincided with His descent into Hades, since the apostle associates it with His death (3: 18); (2) they were *disembodied* spirits to whom Christ preached, since they are characterized as having "aforetime" been disobedient (3: 20). They are, in fact, designated as contemporaries of Noah (3: 20) and were therefore drowned in the flood twenty-four hundred years prior to the death and descent of Christ.

What, now, was the nature of the Lord's communication to these early malcontents under the divine government? The statement is simply that He "went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Peter 3: 19). The verb translated to preach is *kerussein* in the Greek language and its meaning is to make proclamation as a herald. As the verb has no accusative, however, the *subject* of the proclamation is not stated but must be inferred from the conditions existing. The theory that the Lord declared the doom of the unrighteous dead in His descent into Hades is not tenable because it is based on a misapprehension of the *character* of His mission in the first advent, which is not *judicial* as the theorist assumes but *soteriological* as the Scriptures declare (John 3: 17; 12: 47). The reign of Christ is indeed *mediatorial* and it is plain that

He offers the boon of its saving grace to the race in its *entirety*, since "God our Saviour" "willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2: 3, 4). It is only in His second advent that the Lord will exercise the judicial function and pronounce the doom of the impenitent (Matt. 25: 31-46; John 12: 48). It is not conceivable on general principles, even, that one who would not send the demons into the "abyss" (Luke 8: 31) but suffered them to enter the swine, could, by proclamation, judicially foredoom the unbelieving dead; or that He whose prayer for His murderers yet lingered in His Father's ears could thus inaugurate a preliminary hell by the wanton destruction of hope. Nor does the New Testament use of *kerussein* warrant this gloomy exegesis. The verb is not employed at all to make judicial announcements and when not in connection with *to euaggelion*, the Gospel, it uniformly implies it.

The New Testament use of *kerussein* warrants the conclusion, therefore, that Christ, in His death, extended His mission of *love* also into the realm of the dead. Do the Scriptures, however, confirm the conclusion? Yes, plainly. There is not left the shadow of an excuse, in 1 Peter 4: 6, for a mistake so derogatory to the Messianic character as to make the Lord, like the Cretan Minos, a judge in Hades. "For unto this end," writes the apostle, "was the Gospel preached (euangelisthe)* even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh." In fairly plain language, the apostle here accounts for the preaching of the Gospel to the dead, who had no prior knowledge of its provisions, on the ground that it would be the standard of the final judgment. "Unto this end," or that they might be judged like the living,

* The formation of the verb makes the statement singularly conclusive for the preaching of the Gospel to the dead by Christ. The noun *euangelion* itself was simply equipped with the faculty of making announcement or proclamation. It thus became a verb but remains also practically a noun in the accusative relation, and *euangelisthe* is the statement in *itself* that the Gospel was preached. If, moreover, the reference here is to the Lord's evangelistic mission to the dead (and who can really doubt it?), then does *euangelisthe* also supply the missing accusative to *kerussein* in 1 Peter 3: 14.

"was the Gospel preached even to the dead." The scope of the first advent is therefore as *extensive as the race* and the Gospel is meant for all *generations* as well as for "all nations" (Matt. 28: 19).

Were the gracious provisions of the Gospel, however, made *available* in the middle state? and are the dead given the opportunity to accept or reject Christ as well as the living? It is self-evident that the judgment of the unrighteous dead by the standard of the Gospel would be a judicial pretext and not a measure of justice, if its terms were not *meant* for their acceptance. The Saviour, moreover, could neither trifle with the unsaved nor subject the perishing to the tortures of Tantalus. Nor could the God of love thus mock the wretched beings for whom His Son died. In fact, the preaching of the Gospel implies, in the nature of the case, a *bona fide* offer of salvation. That such gracious offer was indeed made in the instance under consideration is not left doubtful by the last clause of 1 Peter 4: 6 which asserts that the purpose of preaching the Gospel to the dead was that they might "live according to God in the spirit." As it is quite impossible for men in the condition of the fall to conform to the will of God without *accepting* the terms of the Gospel, it is certainly plain that in preaching the Gospel to the dead the Lord offered them the *grace* of the Messianic advent.

Revelation in Hades Limited to Atonement.—The descent of Christ to the dead, like His preceding advent to the living, was an advance on Judaism but in neither case was revelation made in full. Whether ideal or actual, revelation is personal in its final analysis and Christ is the person revealing Himself. The Jewish and Christian eras represent, respectively, the two great stages in His self-revelation. In the former He was typical; in the latter He is antitypal. Christ was *but* the "Rock" that followed the Israelites in the wilderness (1 Cor. 10: 4), since revelation prior to the actual incarnation was *promise* in character. The pre-Christian Christ was therefore but the *ideal* Christ.

At His descent, moreover, the Lord was the *dead* Christ and

it is quite plain that He could not reveal Himself to the dead as the *risen* and *ascended* Christ any more than He could have thus mortgaged the future for the living. At Christ's descent into Hades, therefore, revelation to the dead, like revelation to the living, was limited, as yet, to atonement. Nor indeed was it possible for revelation, *because* it is personal, to develop into regeneration in any proper, historical sense except through the Lord's glorification in His resurrection and ascension, and these events were the *subsequent* stages of His self-revelation.

Revelation in Hades the Guaranty of Pentecost to the Dead. —The Lord fostered faith in the Messianic promise by His assurance to the believers that complete Messianic triumph would speedily follow the seeming disaster of His death. He foretold not only His resurrection and ascension to His disciples (Matt. 16: 21; John 6: 62) but also the climactic descent of the Holy Spirit to inaugurate the Messianic era (Acts 1: 4, 5, 8). May it not, then, be reverently assumed that in His communion with the saints in Paradise, He instructed them likewise concerning the mighty events impending, and that, therefore, His ascent from Hades at Easter was the guaranty of the promised effusion of the Spirit for *their* faith, as much as His subsequent ascension from Olivet was such a guaranty for the faith of the living disciples! Pentecost, like Christmas, was the divine response to human faith and its grace was normally extended to the realm of the dead believers, where, it may be believed, the great day was not the empty echo of the Spirit's outpouring at Jerusalem any more than the descent of Christ into Hades had been the mere proof of His prior advent at Bethlehem. The belief is indeed warranted that "when the day of Pentecost was now come," the Holy Spirit fell also on the expectant believers in Hades and thus vitalized, in their spiritual generation from the *glorified* Christ, the recently made atonement. It is reasonable therefore to conclude that "there were added in that day" many more thousands "under the earth" than were added *on* the earth.

VI.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH IN RELATION TO ORGANIZED CHARITY.

BY LOUIS F. ZINKHAN, A.M.

In the minds of many there is at once a doubt whether there can be any relation between the church and organized charity. With them, organized charity is supposed to stand for something outside of the church, and, in their judgment, at variance with the church. There is a doubt whether there is much charity in organized charity. What is its aim? Is it not to lessen charitable impulses? Is it not largely to prevent the giving of money to aid the poor, and that it is constantly asking for more and larger subscriptions to oil the machinery which is to investigate, and expose, and humiliate the poor? Is it not presumptuous to bring to the attention of the Christian church its relation to organized charity? Is it not true of organized charity what many claim to be true concerning foreign missions, that a very large per cent. is applied to running the thing, and a small per cent. only reaches the heathen, or the beggar, as the case may be.

Is it not also true, say some, that organized charity smothers the best and deepest philanthropic impulses of the christian giver because it is ready to relieve him of the duty of coming face to face with human misery? Does it not ask for his check that it may do his good deeds for him, so that he may not waste his valuable time in the drudgery of doling out his gifts, nor harrow his emotions by gazing upon the many miserable wrecks of human woe?

Let us look for a moment at the other side—the side of the church. Has she always been as broad in her charities as human opportunity would let her be? How then, ask some, do you account for the countless divine fragments of desolate

human souls, whose woes have gone unpitied; whose wounds have gone undressed; whose cries would not be heard?

Has the Christian church not often been selfish? Are there not many ministers who have believed that they were not called to any endeavor outside of their own little circumscribed spiritual bailiwick? That their full duty began and ended with gathering in the children of the church; in keeping their own particular sheep from straying; and in looking after the poor, and dependent, and unfortunate of their own church?

I have known ministers who have blotted from the church records the names of some who went astray and got into prison. That stigma put them not only out of the touch of the church, but left them no hope of getting back into it. I have known church members, because of "necessity's hard pinch," to drift into the almshouse, and by their own spiritual friends and pastors they have been numbered among the forgotten. I once wrote to a minister concerning his son, who had fallen into a criminal life and had been sent to prison. The boy was young; I believe he was penitent; I believe that if the father's hand had been stretched out in forgiveness the boy would have built "a new life on a ruined life"; but the father never answered my letter, and when we met long afterwards he never referred to my work in behalf of his son.

I remember a young woman who was well raised. The insidious and devilish influence of a man tempted her from home; she yielded to sin. Her family was broken hearted. The woman suffered; with many tears she repented. Though reared with many comforts and proud of heart, she begged for forgiveness, and pleaded that she might return home, and as a sign of repentance and humiliation do the merest drudgery in the home. It was a Christian home. The relatives were religious people. But pride was there. This daughter had brought the first disgrace upon their honor. It could not be forgiven. I never saw such grovelling repentance on the part of the sinner; I never witnessed hearts steeled more keenly against forgiveness than this Christian family. I pleaded

with them in behalf of the Magdalene because my faith in her future was strong, but the last message they gave me for her was: "she is dead; she cannot be resurrected." If to be helpless is to be hopeless; if to be once in the clutches of sin means that it is impossible to rise; then indeed are many to be pitied, and the terrible edict must be written over many a home, and hovel, asylum, and prison cell: "leave hope behind who enters here."

Thank God, the number of ministers, churches, and christians is comparatively few, who, in this day and generation shut the door of hope and of renewed opportunity for good to the submerged, the defective, and the degenerate. I have faith in the Christian Church. It is the genius of the church that she makes a handmaid of philanthropy; that wherever she finds woe and anguish, destitution and wickedness, she comes with hope and help, with a tender heart and a strong hand, to do in faith what the Friend of sinners taught and did Himself.

It is worth calling attention to the fact that, immediately after Christ's temptation in the wilderness, He went into His own city Nazareth, where He had been brought up, and came into the Synagogue and there uttered the words which are the first record of His public ministry: "The spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath annointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor; He hath sent Me to heal the broken-hearted; to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." We need no other authority for engaging in the work of lifting up those who have made shipwreck of their virtues and happiness. The very keynote of the Gospel is that "Jesus Christ came into the world to seek and to save them that are lost." Is there a more divinely beautiful and hopeful utterance than this pearl from the lips of the infinitely compassionate redeemer: "I am come, not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance?" To become the friend of the publican and sinner is a glorious trait in the

Savior's character. It will be the joy of the Church to the end of time, and the admiration of heaven forever, that Jesus Christ came to call sinners to repentance, that He is the friend and helper of the vilest of the vile.

Christ had no sympathy for those selfrighteous ones who showed a hard, pitiless, unforgiving spirit towards that class of people who had fallen so far below the standard of human excellence; who had drained the dregs of degradation and had wrecked virtue and happiness. The Master knew the possibilities in human nature; He knew how the wretched circumstances of the outcasts required an almighty friend. Does the sick man need a physician? much more does the sinner need a righteous friend. The Lord went to them accompanied by an invincible, tender, all conquering love; and we need to remember His memorable utterance: "I have left you an example, that as I have done unto you, so do ye also one to another."

The Christian church has made majestic strides in missionary and benevolent work; hospitals, asylums, retreats for every condition of want, helplessness, and woe, have been the peculiar offspring of a Christian civilization; but until the present century very little has been done for those who are in prison, except to offer up the petition: "That it may please Thee to show thy pity upon all prisoners and captives"; and in the present century it is true, I fear, of nearly all christians, what a christian gentleman wrote to me some years ago about work among prisoners, that the churches, "pray cream and live skim milk."

More than thirty years ago, one of my professors, of blessed memory, laid it upon my heart and conscience, whilst I was a student in the theological school, that if I would make my ministry of any account, I should remember the poor and needy, the friendless, and the hopeless. He pressed me into service preaching in the county jail and almshouse, and he himself furnished me not only with the inspiration to do the work, but with horse and carriage to go to the work. This

man would by my own church not have been regarded as orthodox, but he did impress upon me the great truth, phrased in the words of another, that: "A Christianity that will not help those struggling from the bottom upward, needs another Christ to die for it."

Let me say, and emphasize it as a cardinal truth, that: "if the world is ever to be saved, the bottom needs to be lifted up." Young men, entering into the christian ministry need to feel the sentiment so forcibly expressed by Goethe: "Der ganzen Menschheit Jammer fasst mich an." (The misery of universal humanity appeals to me). The men who enter into life's work in this spirit will "become the apostles of life; the prophets of service; the messiahs of to-morrow."

Organized charity may be public or private. It may be organized and maintained by and for the church; it may be carried on by private munificence outside of the churches and for the general good; or it may be supported by municipalities, states, and governments for the benefit of certain classes who are properly public charges, and for whom provision can be made in no other way. The oldest and many of the best charities are those supported by the church; chief among these are the church orphan asylums, homes for the aged and the infirm, and hospitals; and the tender, loving ministrations, of the King's Daughters, guilds, and kindred societies.

If I ventured upon a criticism of any of these charities it would be in regard to the prevailing method of admitting children in the orphan asylums. Of late years there has been a "forward movement" in some of them, but others still cling to the old method of receiving, training, and holding the children in the orphanages much longer than need be; which means, not only increased financial responsibility on the part of the church, but sometimes the loss of splendid opportunities to the children.

My theory is that orphanages should not provide on an extensive scale for the permanent custody of the normal, but of

the abnormal, unattractive, backward, and crippled children. An institution can never do for a child what a good Christian home can do. In saying this I am in no way reflecting upon the devotion, the zeal, the consecrated common sense of those in charge of orphanages. But a *home* is what a child needs, and what will best develop its life, and let us say that there are plenty of good Christian homes, and plenty of men and women of the best Christian type (childless themselves), who are ready and anxious to receive, adopt, support, train, and love children as members of the family. The abnormal, defective, or crippled child lacks the attractions which appeal to those who have no children of their own, and who wish to adopt one or more. Naturally they want a child which will give promise of development, affection, and gratitude.

I know of an institution which for more than forty years has been active in keeping poor, dependent, orphan children out of institutions; which has provided good homes for more than 4,000 of them; which kept oversight of them through all the years of their minority by correspondence and visitation, and not one per cent. of them turned out bad.

Of course, I am aware that the orphan asylums will not be so attractive if they have charge only or mainly of the unattractive and abnormal kind of children; they will not be able to make as fine a show; but they will have, may I say it, greater reward in gathering in and ministering to the crippled, forbidding, unappreciative, and fragmentary lives, on whom so little pity, compassion, and kindness are usually spent.

Every church should have some organized form of charity work. It opens up the fountains of interest, love, and sacrifice; it develops an atmosphere of sweet fellowship, of holy zeal, of spiritual growth in the church. This is especially true where those who give come in personal touch with those who are the recipients of good deeds.

For years I have watched with keen and loving interest certain forms of charity in the church which strongly appealed to

me. One church, I remember, which had a strong, active society of women, whose business it was to make all kinds of garments to be given to the needy poor; it even employed and paid a number of poor women for assisting in making the garments; it gathered up many useful toys and distributed them among sick, crippled, and poor children. It constantly sought opportunities and means of helping the helpless, in and out of the parish.

In Washington there are colored churches whose charity work is as rare as it is beautiful. One large colored church (in which I have had the pleasure of speaking) has in its very large membership quite a number of aged, infirm, poor and dependent members. Some of them are maintained by families in the church; others have their home in the District Almshouse. Special consideration is given to these cases. Once a year a service is devoted to the members who cannot ordinarily attend church on account of some disability. Carriages are provided in which these people are brought to and from the church. The same thing is done for those in the almshouse. A special sermon is preached to them; the holy communion is administered to them; after the service a sumptuous dinner is provided in one of the rooms of the church for them; the cooking and serving are done by the best colored cooks and waiters; the afternoon is given over to an informal reunion in the church, and the strong vie with each other to entertain and to do honor to the old, poor, blind, crippled fathers and mothers in Israel. It is a day to be remembered for a year; it becomes a memory whose sweetness endures.

There are a number of churches in Washington which send organized committees every Sunday to the almshouse, hospital, and workhouse for religious services. Statedly during the year they also provide delightful musical and literary entertainments to the almshouse wards; and occasionally they come out in force to provide a feast of good things for the poor; distributing with their own hands perhaps a wagonload of ice-cream, cakes, fruit, candy, tobacco, aprons, etc.

The charity work of the church is one of her arms of power, influence, and blessing; yet I do not believe, nor do I wish to be understood as saying, that charity is the chief function of the church. Its great function is the spiritual uplifting of humanity; the salvation of mankind. The church finds men struggling at the bottom and it inspires them with hope and courage; it puts heart in them; it strengthens faith; develops character; it brings the divine and human in touch with each other.

Another great work of the church is the prevention of the growth and development of evil. Charity is the natural and necessary complement to these aims; therefore it has always been encouraged and fostered by the church at all times.

Many churches, whilst they have increased in their liberality towards the less fortunate, have not always advanced in discrimination, considerateness, and practical alleviation of human misery. Indeed, it seems that many churches have fallen behind and have degenerated in practical charity work. Bishop Potter, in an address made a few years ago, declared that "the work was better done a century ago than now"; much of it was more wisely done, and obtained better results. Charity was not organized then as now; it was done by the individual to the individual. It was the giving of thought, and love, and help of the strong to the weak, and it bore fruit in alleviating misery, and in restoring many of the dependent and unfortunate to self-respect and self-support.

Many of our churches to-day work by this method and in this spirit; their work speaks for itself. But alas, there are others, and many of them, which for want of thought and consideration towards the poor, as well as towards the defective and dependent classes, have done irreparable harm, and have really injured many a life that might have been saved. If our physicians would treat the sick with as little thought and skill as many of the churches treat the distressed and delinquent ones, there would be a much higher rate of mortality. Some

have seriously raised the question whether some churches are not doing more harm than good by their methods of administering to the needy and distressed. Some of them, I am sure, would do no more harm if they did no charity work at all.

There are those who honestly believe that it would be better for society, if some of the worthy poor were left to struggle in their misery, and the unworthy were utterly forsaken than that some of the thoughtless and pernicious methods as practiced in other days should continue and all the wretched consequences, that are evident to those who consider the matter at all seriously.

Many clergymen, who have given more serious attention to helping the poor and distressed than most of their parishioners, must feel ashamed when they recall how often they have been duped by unscrupulous pretenders, and how much sympathy and money they have thrown away, because they would not take the time and trouble to consider many of the cases which forced themselves upon them. Some of us have compared notes with our brethren, and as our dullness or weakness was made manifest by our folly in helping and encouraging the impostor and fraud, we have derided ourselves, but notwithstanding this and our determined resolves to "sin no more," we have in a little while forgotten what manner of men we were and suffered ourselves to be caught in the same traps.

It was Henry Ward Beecher who said long ago that "the next worst thing to not helping a man, is to help him." It is all right not to let your left hand know what the right hand is doing, but it is most important to see that the right hand, if it does anything, does the right thing always. Charity must not be blind. Indiscriminate charity is a wrong against society. So much of the "help" extended to those who need our assistance in bearing their burdens is hasty, perfunctory, ill-advised, sentimental, or emotional, that it is all important to lay down certain fixed principles of wise charity. It has

been well said that "the one standard by which to determine the kind of help required by the poor is that which shall put the individual or household in honest and respectable relations with society." Our present methods are not good enough. We need to seek a more excellent way. The really hard thing to get for many of the destitute and unfortunate is personal kindness, the alms of friendship, discretion, understanding and sacrifice. Our money will increase the evils we are trying to eradicate unless we give thought, consideration, and personal interest. Experience has proved that in the vast majority of cases applications for aid come not from those who are worthy, but from the unworthy, and that whilst here and there some charities are worthily bestowed, there are too many, on the other hand, wretchedly administered. The church has learned, and that not many years back, that to accomplish more real good it was necessary to organize within the church, associations, organizations, and orders, to provide plans, methods, and schemes for well-directed and effective charitable effort. With the church societies the church has no quarrel, but of the organized charities outside of the church she is often suspicious and at variance, and therefore does not always give to the latter the interest and co-operation they should have. This is to be wondered at, too, when we remember that three-fourths, or more, of the workers in organized charities are members of the various churches.

For many reasons the relation of the church to organized charities should be of the most friendly character. These societies represent the most advanced thought and experience in charity work. They have made the problem of charity the subject of painstaking and scientific investigation; they have from accumulated experience gathered facts which are invaluable; and they offer to churches and to individuals the results of their experiences; they offer to make your love and liberality more skillful by the light of their knowledge; they gather for your guidance information that will prevent the

squandering of your pity and help on the unworthy; they relieve at your request thousands of unfortunate ones who have felt "necessity's sharp pinch."

Organized charity in cities is no longer an experiment. It has given a reason for its existence. The object of organized charity is to reach the individual,—every individual in distress needing help. Its thought, its mission, its responsibility is to the worthy and the unworthy. To all these it must bring help if it can, to put them on their feet again, to give heart to the discouraged, health to the sick, employment to the idle, sunshine to those who are in the dark, methods of self-help to those floundering in helplessness. The work of these organized charities challenges the admiration and confidence of the churches. Who is not moved and stirred by the work of Charles L. Brace, who sent 40,000 New York waifs to homes in the West, and put hope and manliness into the hearts of thousands of newsboys; of Mary Carpenter, who has done a life work in Liverpool; of Octavia Hill, who by wise methods turned filth-saturated courts in London into scenes of cleanliness and order, and transformed rough men into patterns of thrift and sobriety! Look at the splendid work which is being done to-day by organized effort to stay the awful inroads of the white plague; to improve housing conditions; providing playgrounds for children crowded in unsanitary homes; providing summer outings for the poor and sick!

Organized charity has by energetic effort largely overcome the intolerable evil of herding hundreds of loafing and idle men night after night in station houses, unfed and unwashed; it has by keen discrimination and by its untiring influence upon legislation reduced the great army of tramps, who infested our almshouses, our hospitals, and our streets. They are still in evidence, but they are by no means so formidable as they used to be. Despite the encouragement given to tramps by many of the church people, who feared that they might offend an angel unawares, these societies have been able

to reduce their number. Many of us eagerly listened to their tales of woe and have fed and clothed them in laziness. Of all men we have treated the tramp the worst. Look at the noble work of the Associations for improving the Condition of the Poor; the Charity Organization Societies; the Associated Charities; the St. Vincent de Paul Societies, and others, which annually bring so much real hope and help to thousands of unfortunate people by prompt investigations and timely aid.

Read the records of the trained agents who open the door of hope to hundreds struggling to get a living; look at the records of work secured, families made self-sustaining, friendless ones provided with friendly visitors to sympathize, counsel, and relieve them with infinite tact and delicacy. There are many other organized charities which are doing good work in relieving distress, throwing safeguards around our homes, and sanctifying the powers of our churches by work within and without; and yet many of our churches stand aloof from them, do not give them sanction and support, do not seek their coöperation. I have attended a number of the sessions of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, which are usually represented by many hundred delegates of the foremost organized charities throughout the United States and Canada. These meetings contribute some of the very best literature in the work of charities and corrections. Yet it has been noted again and again at the great sessions there would not be half a score of ministers in attendance to give sanction and recognition to such a great work.

Of course, the ministers have their excuses. One will say that the church ought to be doing all the work. The church had the opportunity but often passed it by. Another will say that these societies are slow in giving their alms. But is it not true that gifts of thought and of effort are more truly charitable than the mere gift of money? Others think it is cruel to harrow the feelings of the distressed and needy by

scrutinizing closely their condition. But, as long as our churches, through mistaken delicacy towards the needy, will insist on giving blindly, their efforts will prove worse than useless. The first impulse of charity is not always the true or right; and the easiest thing is by no means the best.

Indiscriminate charity is nearly always in error. What should we think of a physician who dared to give medicine without first diagnosing his case? Is it less sinful to relieve a distressed man without attempting to learn the source or the kind of distress, and ascertain what kind of help would most wisely and effectively relieve his distress? Have you ever attempted to follow up the results of thoughtless and indiscriminate giving? Have you given clothes and shoes to the stranger? In many cases they will find their way to some shops for the price of a few drinks. Is it money for food? In most cases it is spent at a bar where a free lunch goes with the drink. Is it a letter of confidence or recommendation? We have seen some that our brethren have written, and they have been used for years. Much usage has made them yellow, and greasy, and tattered, but they are still profitable, so the holders paste them together and continue their work. How many of us, as we review past experiences must make the confession of the benevolent old lady, whose eyes were only opened late in life: "I tried to do good, but I didn't know how, and I did more harm than good."

I remember hearing a clergyman make a confession that, as a young man jealous to do good and eager to relieve all who called upon him, he acted thus: "I begged from the rich and gave to the poor." Finally, an experienced charity worker took him in hand, and it did not take him long to learn as he went over his cases and sifted them that most of his benevolence and sympathy had been wasted.

Organized charity does not intend that you should give less, but more. It wants to save waste. If you help a man for a day or two and then leave him in the same condition you have

wasted your substance. It is far better to spend fifty dollars on one case and relieve it adequately and permanently than to hand it in small sums to three score persons who will only waste it. Our organized charities are doing splendid work. They are ready to serve us; we should use them; get the benefit of their experience and information; we should encourage and support them.

I venture to remark that many of our churches indulge too exclusively in denominational charity, unwilling to give anything that is not distributed within the fold. The Master said: "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also must I gather, and there shall be one shepherd and one fold." Religious duty is not entirely performed when denominational or parochial charities are being supported by the church. There must be a readiness and willingness to give genuine help in the general effort for improving conditions in society. One of the splendid signs of the times is the fact that a number of our universities, colleges, theological seminaries, and other professional schools have developed and are maintaining courses and departments of instruction in social theory and practice, and some of them have furnished the most highly specialized and practical workers in philanthropic and social service.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

VII.

CAUSES AND REMEDIES FOR THE SCARCITY OF MINISTERS.

BY THE REV. D. B. LADY, D.D.

There seems to be at present an unusual scarcity of ministers of the gospel and the number of students in many of the theological seminaries is not as large as it was ten years ago. It is feared by many that the progress of the church will be seriously hindered if this state of things continues. It is the purpose of this paper to mention and discuss some of the reasons for the scarcity of ministers and candidates for the ministry, which all earnest Christians deplore, and to point out some of the ways in which, perhaps, at least a partial change for the better may be brought about.

This is not an entirely new condition. Christ said, in his day, "the harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few." That there were but few ministers to be had was a great hindrance to the work of the Reformed Church in this country, when German emigrants first found homes here. It is hard to estimate how much stronger and more useful our church might have been, during all the decades of her history in the new world, if we could have had a full supply of ministers in early times to gather our scattered people and others into congregations and pastoral charges and to build them up in spiritual life. The inadequate supply of ministers was, later on, one of the chief reasons for the founding of a theological seminary and a college. Thirty-five years ago one of the professors at Mercersburg said to the students that he had letters from fifty vacant charges making inquiry as to the prospect of securing members of the graduating class of the seminary for the supply of their pulpits; and the seminary graduated but a very small class that year. Afterwards for a number of years the

demand for ministers seemed to be more fully met. Now we are again confronted by the scarcity which was characteristic of some former periods of our history.

It is important that we fully understand this condition. Being aware of our present difficulties, we should inquire earnestly into the reasons of their existence, and endeavor to find and apply the remedies for them. We cannot be too deeply impressed with this undesirable state of things. The discussion of the subject should not cease until the causes of what we deplore are discovered, the disease located, the antidote discovered and given, and a cure effected. Our success in the great work to which the Church is devoted, the saving of souls and the building up of the Kingdom of Christ, depends on this. But the fact that the Church at large, and our own Church in particular, had this same difficulty to contend with before and overcame it, while in no way belittling the seriousness of the present situation, gives us confidence that, as at other times, the causes of it may be discovered and a more desirable condition be brought to prevail.

1. Among the reasons for the present scarcity of ministers (the repetition of the phrase will be pardoned) the first one to which the reader's attention is called is: that perhaps no sufficient appeal is made to the spirit of self-sacrifice in presenting the claim of the church for such service to the young men of our day.

Two things may be taken as true. First, there is in the human heart, naturally, a spirit of heroism. All men have this and what they do is more or less affected by it. Second, this is especially felt by young men. Some men, of course, have this in larger measure than others.

A father, *e. g.*, makes a life-long struggle for the maintenance of a large family. Self is forgotten. He has set out to feed, clothe, shelter and educate those whom God has given him. He stands alone, or with his wife, between his helpless offspring and starvation and ignorance and perhaps disgrace

and crime. A coward would desert them and give up the fight when it becomes difficult. A true father stands to his colors and only surrenders with his life. And the situation brings out something very admirable in his character which would not have been developed under other conditions. This spirit of heroism has much to do with the discovery and settlement of new countries and with explorations among uncivilized and savage people.

When a country is in danger and treasure and life must be given up that it may be preserved the heroic in men is appealed to. Men give up their fortunes, they loose their health, they lay down their lives, and they do this willingly. Many nations well worth preserving would have perished had not men of this heroic mould been found ready to sink personal interests and advantages for the good of the nation. History is, in large measure, the record of deeds of self-forgetfulness for the public good in times of danger. The historian takes pleasure in recording such acts; the student in reading and filling his soul with them.

From the beginning the church has given ample opportunity for the exercise of this quality in men. Christ was unselfish, devoted to a grand cause, and willing to suffer for it. The apostles had the same spirit. They counted not their comforts nor their lives dear to them when laboring to lead men to Christ. The Church has a noble army of martyrs on the catalogue of her illustrious leaders. And the prospect of suffering has never been a hindrance but rather a help to her progress in gaining converts.

It may be that in recent years we have not made the claim upon young men to devote themselves to the ministry on this ground strong enough. We have not addressed ourselves to the spirit of unselfish devotion of which the man and christian is capable, nor asked him to give himself to the service of the Church on the ground that such service demands the giving up of the wealth and honors which many men value supremely.

2. It has been urged, on the other hand, that young men do not enter the ministry in sufficiently large numbers to supply the needs of the Church because too much must be given up in many cases by those engaged in this calling. It has been claimed that if the minister were always reasonably sure of employment, of an honorable position in society, of a generous remuneration for his services and of being provided for in old age, many young men would adopt this calling who now enter other lines of work. It is claimed, moreover, that to look for such things is not unmanly, nor even unchristian, nor incompatible with such consecration to a great cause as the ministry involves.

Almost every young man of ability and culture will exercise some foresight when about to choose a profession. He will examine the claims upon him of different possible careers and his own inclinations and the material rewards assured by each one. It is easy to see how even a conscientious and God-fearing young man may reason on this subject. He may say, I have an inclination for the law or engineering. I take that as an indication that I am adapted to the law or engineering. I will enjoy the work. I will probably succeed in it. There is a fair remuneration for the lawyer and the engineer. Avenues of advancement are open in these professions. There are many large fees and great prizes set before the lawyer. A judgeship, an attorney-generalship, a seat in Congress or in the United States Senate or even the Presidency may be won. As an engineer, a man may become the head of an important manufacturing establishment or of a great railroad. There is no such remuneration for the minister. There are no great prizes set before him. There is no great fame to be won in his calling.

It is evidently not the will of God that every christian young man of good ability should enter the ministry. The profession would soon be overcrowded if this were done. God can be acceptably served in other walks of life. A lawyer or an engineer is doing the will of God too. It would be a pity

to spoil a good lawyer or even a good bricklayer to make a poor preacher. Other things being equal, then, or being considered so, the decision falls upon the side of the greatest earthly returns. The difficulty is that of late years too large a percentage of young men have been taking this position.

In the army and navy the two motives spoken of are combined. And there are always plenty of candidates for these professions. There is an appeal to the unselfish and heroic. The boy feels that he is entering the service of the State. He is to live, and, if necessary, die for his country. His patriotism is appealed to. Courage and self-sacrifice are demanded of him. On the other hand candidates for the military or naval academy are carefully selected, so that it is already a distinction to be accepted as such. And they are trained to carry themselves properly and to dress well. Army and navy officers constitute an aristocracy. They are admitted into the best society. They associate with the best people. There is no question about their employment. The government which educated them gives them work. Their remuneration also is certain and it is twice as large as that of the ministry, a class of men of at least equally high character and training. The army and navy officer is advanced as he grows older and with each advance his salary is largely increased, and at sixty-five years of age he is retired on half pay. The older ministers in the church, other things being equal, often get smaller salaries than the younger ones, and there is little provision made for their old age. In times of war the soldier may win great distinction, and a few obtain lasting fame. There is not much prospect of a minister's attaining anything of this kind.

3. Another reason for the decrease of candidates for the ministry may be found in the great opportunities for secular work which are presented to young men in this age. The organization of society—the industries, the business and the professions—presents many openings for pleasant, gentlemanly and remunerative employment, which were comparatively unknown in former times. Much of the manual labor

of the country is done by recent emigrants, whilst our American youth find employment as clerks, managers, agents, telegraph operators, book-keepers, auditors, and so on; and there is a constant demand for young men for these lines of work at fair salaries. The country has never seen a more prosperous period than that which we are passing through at the present time. Mines and mills have been multiplying. All industries are flourishing. Crops have been abundant and the acreage under cultivation is increasing year by year. The supply of money is sufficient, its circulation is unhindered and the sums on deposit are enormous. Wages and salaries are high and go up from time to time, and so an increasing number of openings are found for young men in the industrial and business enterprises of the age. With less than half the time and money spent in general and special training which a candidate for the ministry needs to prepare himself for his work, young men are fitted for good positions at fair salaries in industrial and business enterprises. Because it is comparatively easy to obtain a position and a comfortable salary in worldly work, of the large majority of young men going into such work, no doubt many might under other circumstances enter the ministry. With all a young man's will power, and making due account of the high ideals which are apt to be strong in youth, the line of least resistance has much to do, in many cases, in determining the choice of a profession. It is probably true that in dull times the candidates for the ministry increase and in good times they decrease. Nor are young men to be wholly condemned for this. There is a legitimate secular side to life, and a true Christian philosophy will make account of it.

In prosperous times the division of charges and the organization of new congregations and the establishment of new missions at home and abroad as well as the endowment of additional professorships in our colleges and seminaries goes on much more rapidly also than in dull times, and there is an increased demand for ministers to fill these positions, and

when there is no corresponding increase of ministers the absence of it is severely felt. In our Church during the last twenty years many country charges have been divided and many new congregations have been organized in growing towns and cities. Our general financial prosperity, as far as such progress depends upon money, has made this possible. A considerable number of younger men have gone to Japan and China and to the west and to new missions in towns and cities. Some have been taken out of the pastorate and appointed to professorships, and there has been no corresponding increase of candidates for the positions formerly existing in the pastorate or newly created. In a word, the prosperity of the country has had the effect of multiplying places for pastors and, at the same time, of interfering with the disposition of young men to select the ministry as a calling, and has thus done much to bring about the present scarcity of ministers. The number of congregations to be served has been increasing, owing to our prosperity, much more rapidly than the number of persons qualified to serve them, owing to the same prosperity.

4. The intensity with which the power of religious convictions lays hold upon men has much to do with the plentifullness or scarcity of candidates for the ministry. When the Church is profoundly impressed with the claims of Christ upon its members for personal service, when it feels deeply the need of the world for the Salvation offered in the Gospel the natural effect will be that a burning desire will arise in the hearts of many young men to become heralds of the cross.

Our present life is many-sided. Various interests absorb our attention. We have a family and social life, an intellectual, a business and a political life. It may easily come about that in the number and force of the things claiming our attention from these various departments the claims of Christ for services in the spread of the Gospel may be relegated to the background. We forget that His advice to the disciples to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness is in a

degree applicable to all men. The Church should have a place in the hearts of all her members peculiar to herself, before which everything else should be made to give way. This may be insisted on and recognized and cultivated in one family or congregation or in one denomination more than in others. This spirit characterizes some congregations and communities especially. Men and women disposed to feel the force of the paramount claim of the Gospel naturally find a home in such churches. And it is from such communities and churches and families that most of our candidates for the ministry come. The cause of the scarcity of candidates for the ministry is no doubt to be found, in part, in the want of warmth in our Christian life. We are too indifferent to the claims of the Gospel. Hence our sons prefer a secular career to that of the ministry of reconciliation.

This statement of the causes for the scarcity of candidates for the ministry indicates the remedies for this state of things, and the discussion of these needs be but brief.

(a) In laying upon the hearts and minds of young men the claims of the Gospel ministry as a calling, we should perhaps appeal more than we have been in the habit of doing, in recent years, to the spirit of self-sacrifice and heroism in the human makeup. To endure hardness for Christ and for men's Salvation is at least as heroic as to do this for wife and children and native land; and this should be pointed out and insisted upon. It is true. It is a legitimate motive of action. Why should it not be urged upon men? It had its influence in times past. It will no doubt have its influence now, if we make proper use of it.

(b) On the other hand it might be well to endeavor to make the position of the ministry a more honorable and comfortable one, from a point of view not strictly religious. To this end more discrimination might be used in the acceptance of candidates for the ministry. They might be subjected to severer physical, mental and moral tests before being admitted to the ranks of those preparing for the sacred calling. The position

of an accepted candidate for the ministry would then already be a distinction in the eyes of men and a legitimate object of a laudable ambition. It is such now from the highest point of view. Might it not be made such on a somewhat lower plane, inasmuch as all men cannot appreciate that which is highest? Then provision might be made that every man, when once fully admitted to the ministry, until he should prove himself entirely unfitted for the office and be forbidden to exercise its functions, should have regular employment. It is humiliating to a sensitive nature to seek a field of labor or to remain in one when no longer giving entire satisfaction. And as things now are the minister is often compelled to do this. Provision should also be made that the minister should have such financial support as to enable him to occupy without embarrassment his place among men of like education and culture with himself. Finally, the Church should perhaps see to it that at least moderate provision be made for the maintenance of her ministers after the age of sixty-five years, either by giving them employment suitable to their years or retiring them upon a pension, should they have no sufficient private provision for their support.

Just to what extent the two causes just mentioned are the true causes of the scarcity of candidates for the ministry, and how the corresponding remedies may be applied in all their minute details the writer will not attempt to say. He will only suggest that they are perhaps worthy of consideration.

(c) The suggestion that in prosperous times many who might under other conditions enter the ministry are drawn into secular lines of work is no doubt true. For this no remedy growing out of the state of business is to be sought. Financial prosperity or the reverse is not within the control of the church. And if it were possible to do so, it would not be wise to change good times into bad times for the sake of having the ranks of the ministry recruited. The remedy here lies in the use of means disconnected with our financial affairs. It would perhaps be true to say that it is indicated by a discussion of the fourth point.

(d) The fourth reason mentioned for the scarcity of candidates for the ministry is a strictly religious one: viz., the lack of intensity in our religious convictions and feelings, of enthusiasm for the cause of Christ and the salvation of souls, the general absence of that overpowering strength of the claims of the Gospel upon our lives and services which a few men in every age of the church have felt. It is the aim of the Church, of course, to have every convert feel that the Kingdom of God and His righteousness is of supreme account. These overshadow altogether mental culture, secular comforts, financial success, professional eminence, high position or great fame. "The love of Christ constraineth us," says the great apostle. Every Christian feels this, no doubt. But we do not all feel it in the same degree. If we could all be made to feel it more than we do the claims of the Gospel would have more power over us. We would gladly consecrate a larger percentage of our time, labor and money to the work of Christ in the world, more parents would be willing and anxious to give their sons to the ministry, and educate them for the work, and more young men would be found to devote themselves to the sacred calling, notwithstanding all the hindrances in the way. As love to God grows cold the ranks of the ministry become depleted. As love to God grows warm the vacant places of the watchmen upon the wall of Zion will be occupied. More faithful preaching and more importunate prayer for the presence of the grace of God and for the presence and power of the Spirit will overcome the Church's coldness and promote the earnestness and zeal for Christ and the objects for which He was revealed and will so multiply the heralds of the cross that the waste places of the Church will blossom and be made fruitful.

The condition discussed in this paper is a grave one. It is worthy of earnest investigation. Some of its causes and remedies have been spoken of here. There may be many others. We should not shrink from looking the situation in the face. That would be cowardly. To open our eyes to, and acknowled-

edge the existence of, an undesirable state of things, is the first step in its correction. We should meditate upon our present scarcity of ministers and of candidates for the ministry, talk about it, write about it, preach upon it, pray over it, and add our efforts to our prayers to have it corrected. Above all, "pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into His harvest." How often in the history of individuals and of the church has man's extremity proved God's opportunity.

VIII.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

WHAT WOULD JESUS DO?

Much of Christian life in our day, it may be said in a general way, springs from the answer men give to this inquiry. Much of its superficiality, no doubt, is due to this fact. In some way the question has come to be a popular test of correct moral conduct and of faithfulness to religious principle. The desire to imitate Him who is man's great Exemplar is of course in every one and everywhere a praiseworthy ambition. The attempt to realize the desire must almost necessarily result in elevating and beautifying the conduct and character of individuals, as well as in transforming and bettering social relations and conditions. So far as Jesus can be taken as an example for man's imitation, the purpose so widely characteristic of present-day life may be frankly recognized as having a real value and significance. Not a word in disparagement of it need be spoken.

At the same time, however, it is well to be reminded that this principle of imitation can be practically applied only to a narrowly limited area of human life and duty, of religious privilege, and for abiding comfort. A test, much more far-reaching than the popular one here under reference, it would seem, should be available to support us in our conviction that we are entitled to be called Christians, and to inspire in us a steadfast devotion to "the upward calling of God" which the Gospel addresses to us. The subjective evidence arising for us out of our personal efforts to follow the footsteps of Jesus, is not equal to our needs. It is not only inadequate even

when at its best; it is too variable also, and uncertain a quantity to carry the weight of life's real perplexities and burdens. The true test of the reality and significance of our religion, must cover life in its entirety, must be capable of directing us in all our affairs and experiences, and must lend itself to the solution of our gravest problems and deepest mysteries.

Convictions like these, it is gratifying to note, are in current thought receiving proper expression. Thinking men are protesting on the one hand against the making of the question, 'What would Jesus do?' a universally binding law of life for us, and on the other hand they are suggesting the richer, the all-embracing fact, that in our 'mystical union with Christ' —the fact which Christian faith accepts and in the knowledge of which it rejoices,—there resides the power which is sufficient to supply all the needs of man and to support him in all his experiences. Dr. John Watson, for instance, in a recent contribution to an English theological journal makes an incidental observation which is to the point on the question under consideration. With the clear insight that so often characterizes his utterances, he declares that "the necessary difference in the attitude of Christ to the public life of his day, and of the Church to the life of our day, makes it a specious and pernicious fallacy to suppose that we can and ought to regulate our action by the question 'What would Jesus do?' as if there were no difference in the environment of men, and no difference in function between Christ and Christians." He leaves no one in doubt as to the final disposition he makes of this method of regulating one's course of life and developing one's character, and the grounds on which he rests his conclusions seem thoroughly valid.

Equally explicit and apropos are the contentions on the same topic of the great scholar to whom Dr. Watson is so largely indebted for the literary prominence he is enjoying. In an address before the National Free Church Council at Birmingham, England, last March, the Editor of the *Ex-*

positor used the following striking language: "Though many who use the phrase employ it without evil intention, yet certainly we are to condemn the counsel, 'Be Christs.' There is only one Christ; there is one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus. There is one Head crowned and anointed, and only one. For the rest, it is sufficient that they should be Christians, sharing in the benefits of his life, his death, and his resurrection triumph. We can indeed say of him most surely that he walked in Palestine more unerringly than Plato or Confucius, or any great teacher of the world, in the sphere appointed him. It was he and he alone who never swerved from the straight paths of righteousness and love. But we want to do more than follow him in these ways. We have to set our feet in paths he never trod, and we want the strength to keep us true. Assuredly, Christianity is the manifestation of the life that is an example. But we want more than a flawless example. We need the mystical union. We need to take, in its full strength, the truth that we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones, and that he lives now as a human body with a human soul, and imparts life to the frail and trembling spirits that stumble in their following of his way."

Those who have an intelligent grasp of the Master's own teachings concerning the absolute necessity to "abide in him and he in us" need not be told that such views have beneath them the revealed mind of Christ himself, nor that his mind is dominant in the theology of the apostolic writings and in the whole field of the personal lives of their authors. It was not the example of the earthly career of Jesus, but the realized union of the early disciples with the glorified Person of Christ, that constituted for them the well-spring of their regenerate and restored humanity. It was the mystical union that constituted for them, the source whence they received the new power which irradiated their lives and gave such a convincing and converting power to the words they spoke in the name

of Christ. To their personal, living union with the enthroned Lord, they owed the splendor of their hallowed characters,—a splendor which burst upon sinful and suffering humanity with an effect similar to that of strong, spring sunshine upon sleeping nature. It brought forth new life, it scattered new hope and cheer among men everywhere, it was the revelation of the mystery hid from the ages, Christ's own presence in his followers. This is the great truth of the Gospel which to-day is deserving of renewed emphasis. Its realization and proclamation give power and efficaciousness to Christian effort in general, and to the office of the holy Ministry in particular. With it, the preacher of the Gospel delivers his message in the power of God,—without it, his words are less than sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal.

The realization of the personal, living union of the Christian with Christ, just referred to, is a matter of faith, however, rather than of conscious experience. Dr. Nicoll whom we have above quoted, in our judgment rightly insists on this phase of the truth. "What we need," he says, "is a union with the glorified Son of the Father, which exists when we are not conscious of it. That is, our union with Christ is not identical with communion. Sometimes the glory of the union is consciously realized, more often it is obscured. It is there however all the while, faith knows, whether the cloud abides or lifts." If anyone is in doubt as to the importance and far-reaching value attaching to this feature of Christianity thus emphasized, let him read an article written by the late Professor Thomas G. Apple, D.D., on "Christian Life Deeper than Conscious Experience," published in the thirtieth volume of this REVIEW.* That article is not only one of the richest and most illuminating of the many preserved in the pages of this Journal from his keen intellect and warm religious heart,—it ranks really as one of the foremost contributions made in the last generation by American philosophical scholars, to theological literature.

* Issue of January, 1883, pp. 40-64.

In language that is as clear and gracious as it is profound and conclusive, it discusses the question at issue from the psychological and historical view-points, and shows the deceptive and dangerous nature of the fallacies against which the learned writers above mentioned, are now arguing. After referring to the theological controversies which for a generation prior to the publication of this powerful dissertation, had disturbed the peace of our Church, as "an honorable historic struggle that tested to the utmost its strength and unity," he observes, that it ended "in settling us the more firmly, intelligently, and unitedly upon the basis of our venerable and tried Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism." Among the great truths contained in that Confession, he then instances these as of central and universal importance, namely,—that "the religion of Christ is a new *Life*, begotten in the soul by the Holy Spirit, through the Word of God; that as *Life*, it is broad and deep as the nature of man, reaching the inmost depths of the human spirit, and renewing the whole of our humanity; that it is not measured by our personal knowledge or conscious experience; and that it is joined in indissoluble union with the divine life of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which vital union with this source of life it is preserved from destruction." The soul, supported by faith in the revealed truth of this living union with Christ, the incarnate Son of God, one can readily perceive, rests on ground infinitely more secure, than that which can be subjectively provided by asking merely, "What would Jesus do?"

THE AUTHORITY OF CHRIST.

Several years ago the British press issued a book entitled "The Christ of History and Experience," the contents of which many regard as permanently important in the development and progress of Christian Theology. It deals with the problem of Christology, which the Abbe Loisy says, has been "la vie et le tourment" of the Church, in a way that com-

mands the reverent attention and abundantly rewards the most careful study of its wealth-laden pages. From the beginning to the end of its several chapters, the book shows its author's work to be the result not only of competent theological and philosophical knowledge, of a sincere desire to know and expound the truth as it is in Jesus, and of faith in him as the incarnate Son of God and the Saviour of mankind; but likewise of heroic courage in setting aside traditional theories which in the light of modern historic and scientific research do no longer command the assent of religious conviction. The book does all this with such a satisfactory balance of discriminating judgment, such enlightening power and winsomeness of spirit and vigor of language, that the few references American writers have been seen to make to the author, lead one to infer that as yet he has not received in our country the attention to which he is so preeminently entitled.

During the sessions of the Alliance of Reformed Churches held at Liverpool in 1904, these views of the Rev. Dr. Forrest, to whose authorship we owe the volume, were justified and established by the ability he displayed in discussing certain controverted biblical questions in their relations to Christ and his teachings. Probably but few of the Americans then privileged to hear him, identified the speaker as the author of the volume under notice, but everyone, it is certain from the attention he commanded and the applause he received, recognized him as a man having uncommon equipment of learning and most felicitous powers of literary expression. Those delegates of the Reformed Church in the United States who were present on the occasion, one may venture to add, were amazed and gratified to hear him speak as he did, in their "own tongue the wonderful works of God," after they had listened to a number of traditionalists dilating upon views that seemed foreign to the thought that rules among us. It was no surprise, therefore, to see so many of our brethren gathering around Dr. Forrest after the adjournment of the session,

with the desire of personally meeting him and thanking him, on discovering his identity, for the helpful book he had written on the historical and spiritual nature and significance of Christ.

From the Edinburgh publishers of the admirable book which has brought this author the deserved fame he is enjoying, there has just now come another volume* which, if possible, lays thinking men under still greater obligation to this Scotch theologian. It bears the title which is placed at the head of this article, and which will at once suggest that in it, the subject treated in the earlier book and discussed in some of its aspects in the Liverpool addresses, is continued and more fully elaborated. Readers of the desultory observations appearing in successive issues of this REVIEW on current religious and theological thought, will readily agree with a recent wide-awake writer, that "no questions grip the public mind more closely to-day than the application of the teaching of Jesus to public and private life." Men everywhere are asking, he correctly affirms, "what has Jesus to say, directly or indirectly, either in principle or detail, upon such matters as the interpretation of Holy Scripture, the character of God, the destiny of man,—in one department of thought; and the relation of the Church and State, the function of the State in religious education, the standard of morals for the State,—in another department?" And when one qualified as Dr. Forrest has shown himself to be, essays to give answer to such and kindred inquiries, it goes without saying, more than ordinary interest will thereby be elicited.

Believing, as our author reports himself as doing, that "there is no religious problem which more urgently requires consideration at the present time," than that to the solution of which he is here addressing himself, it is not strange that he should begin by studying the Christological foundations

* "The Authority of Christ," by David W. Forrest, D.D. Cloth, pp. 437. T. and T. Clarke, Edinburgh, 1906.

underlying the problem. Two luminous chapters are devoted to this study. The first deals with the "Recognition of Christ as the Incarnate Son," whilst the second points out the "Illegitimate Extension of Christ's Authority," as developed in the course of the Church's history. In the former one the authority of Jesus is shown to be grounded on the two qualities of his personal sinlessness, and his mediatorship or lordship. The place of Christ's resurrection in the argument for his Deity, he shows also, is not for us what it was for the Apostles. In his view the sinlessness of Jesus must be based on the evidence of his own consciousness, *and* that of historical investigations, which latter the Ritschlian school contends is only a "value-judgment" of Christian faith. Moreover, he insists that in the interests of spiritual experience, it is important to distinguish clearly between Christ as incarnating the life of God, and Christ as the beloved Son of the Father, who gave him for the saving of the world. The bearing and forcefulness of his argument on the latter point may be illustrated by quoting two of his sentences: "The self-sacrifice of Christ is a self-sacrifice on the part of the divine nature, and it consists not simply in what, as the Son of man, he suffered, but supremely in what he abandoned that he might become man. . . . We may talk as we will of the love of God for sinners, but if love does not mean for him, sacrifice as it means for us, and in a sense infinitely transcending ours, then it fails to answer our ultimate question and to meet our inmost necessity."

The method pursued and the conclusions reached in dealing with what are regarded by him as unwarranted extensions of Christ's authority, are equally lucid and convincing. "To me," he declares, "it seems that those who maintain a genuine historical Incarnation of the Son of God have not always sufficiently recognized the limitations inherent in an Incarnate life, nor how vital is the illumination of the Spirit, operating through the best activities of men's minds and hearts, for the

discovery of what Christ's authoritative message really is." With the Church in all ages, he recognizes the authority of Christ as final, but only in the realm which, according to the Scriptures, it really is intended to cover. Christ's word is final as to "what man is to believe concerning God, and what duty God requires of man," but in regions beyond, such as history and science, literature and art, to which his authority has been extended, certain interpretations of it must be ruled out as arbitrary and unfounded. "History shows that it is the abiding temptation and recurring blunder of all schools of religious thought" to yield to such an extension of Christ's authority. "The Jews missed the vision of the Messiah when he appeared, because they were certain they knew 'by what methods' God would interpose for their deliverance, and scouted the idea that the Anointed of the Lord would come without the credentials of external splendor and kingly authority. Roman Catholicism thinks it knows 'by what methods' God would declare his will, regards it as plainly absurd that he would vouchsafe a revelation recorded in a book without granting us an authorized interpreter of it, and so is swept into all the extravagances of Papal Infallibility. Protestantism in many of its forms is equally certain that *it* knows the proper conditions and methods of God's self-manifestation, and repudiates the notion of an infallible interpreter, but insists on a literally infallible record as indispensable, and carries on a hopeless struggle against physical science, biblical criticism and comparative religion," quoting the while the supposed authority of Christ's words in various forms for its vindication. The latter error arises from taking a mistaken, Docetic, and unreal view of Christ's humanity, —a view against which it is important for the Church at all times to register emphatic protest. One who has written in appreciation of Dr. Forrest's conspicuous services in this matter, is thoroughly right in saying that "the clear and careful statement of the limitations of our Lord's life, on earth

as given in this book, will prove most serviceable; for just as an abstruse mathematical formula may secure the safety of an iron bridge, so a true idea of Christ's humanity will save anxious believers from quoting Christ's references to Old Testament Scripture as if they were dicta in the region of higher criticism, and from being concerned because he has not anticipated the theory of evolution."

The next two chapters of the book are devoted respectively, to the consideration of Christ's authority "on God," and "on individual duty." To these, no doubt, the reader of the volume will turn with the keenest interest, and in them he will find a wealth of comment and criticism, of suggestive guidance to correct thought and sound support to intelligent faith, such as will bring rich compensation for the time and attention given to them. After accentuating once more the distinctive sphere where Christ's authority rules, and defining the *kind* of authority which belongs to him Dr. Forrest proceeds to show that the revelation of God which we owe to Christ, resides not merely in what Jesus taught but in what he was, and that he fixes on the ethical quality in man as the *organon* for attaining unto the knowledge of the Deity he revealed. In other words, the verification of ethical and religious truth in general is conditioned by the "venture of faith," and belief in the Father in particular, is not primarily intellectual, but ethical, and attainable therefore along the path of duty through the distinctively spiritual side of our being. Christ appeals to that which is universal in man, and the reason why there are so many in whom his attestation of God, as Father, awakes no response is twofold: In some it is due to moral disloyalty, whilst in others it is due to too narrow an idea of what Truth is, and the application of the methods of physical science in their search after it in the spiritual realm. Certain instruments of knowledge may be valid to reach the ends sought after in one sphere, but wholly wrong and useless if employed in another. The bear-

ing of this upon the problem of suffering is illuminatingly discussed, and the reason why the "remorseless cruelties" of the natural world are not fatal to the Christian belief of God as love, satisfactorily pointed out.

His treatment of individual duty in the light of a true apprehension of Christ's authority, shows the fallacy of putting a literal interpretation, as Tolstoy and Seeley do, upon such utterances as "Resist not him that is evil," "Give to him that asketh thee," and "From him that would borrow of thee turn thou not away." The commandments of Christ must often be divested of the particular *form* in which he put them, in order that their *intention* may be fulfilled by his followers. So also his acts are not designed to be matters of our formal imitation. Just as the Apostles were not determined by the precedents of his earthly career, but by the guidance they received through the Spirit of their living Lord, so his faithful followers in all ages are most loyal to him by keeping the soul open to spiritual influence and obeying the motions thus inspired.

Space forbids us to follow, even in barest outline, the course of thought contained in the three remaining chapters this timely and practically useful contribution to the religious literature of our day. We can only add that the discussion of Christ's authority "on corporate duty" and "on human destiny" reveals the same broad and competent grasp of scholarship and spirituality on the part of the author, and that the concluding chapter on the "Incarnation and the Holy Spirit," inspired by a simple faith and loftiest religious ideals, is alone worth a hundred times over the cost of the book. It is confidently believed that the book should speedily find its way into the hands of hundreds of thoughtful and growing preachers in all churches.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

IX.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

"THE BOOK OF COMMON WORSHIP."

One of the principal features of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., at Des Moines, Ia., was the report of the Committee on Forms and Services. It was appointed by the General Assembly of 1903, continued in 1904, and, after a partial report in 1905, was enlarged by the addition of five ministers, making a membership of eleven ministers and five elders. A final report was submitted at Des Moines in the form of "The Book of Common Worship, published by authority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, for Voluntary Use in the Churches." According to the account of the proceedings of the Assembly published in the *Presbyterian*, "a vigorous debate immediately arose upon presentation of the report of the committee to prepare a book of forms and services. This became so spirited and lengthy that action was deferred until the next day. The opposition to the adoption of the book was very strong. The final conclusion was that all new editions of the book published by the Board of Publication shall contain on the title page that the book was prepared by a committee of the General Assembly for voluntary use. This sends the book forth on its merits without any authoritative adoption by the Assembly, and without any recommendation to the churches to use it. It is a matter of opinion with the individual church." In the course of discussion of the report an opportunity was afforded the opponents for all manner of undesirable expressions. "Canned prayers" were spoken of. The Prayer-Book "smelled of priestcraft." The tendency to ritualism and formalism was

deplored. Jennie Geddes, hurling her stool at the Dean of Edinburgh because he read his prayers, was held up for admiration. With it all, however, the work of the committee, while not adopted, was accepted as suitable for use in those congregations who desired a book of forms in the conduct of worship.

The demand for a book of worship came from every section of the Presbyterian Church. The committee was appointed in response to overtures from the Presbytery of Denver and the Synod of New York—the East and West united in the petition. By a letter of inquiry to the churches the general feelings and wishes of the denomination in reference to a "more thoughtful and beautiful worship" were brought to light. The conclusion of these inquiries was reported as follows: "These figures show beyond question: first, that the movement toward an order of service with responsive features is already going on in three-fourths of our churches; second, that nine-tenths of our ministers desire improvement and better order in the conduct of worship generally in our church; third, that almost all of our ministers wish the people to take part in the service; fourth, that nearly nine-tenths of our ministers wish for more unity in Presbyterian worship, if it can be voluntarily brought about; and finally, that more than four-fifths of them feel the need of a book of forms." With the encouragement which the committee had received in the previous Assemblies and the knowledge of the wide-spread tendencies in favor of a more uniform service, it could with confidence present its work to the last Assembly, although a majority might become painfully demonstrative in its opposition.

Yet when one examines the preface and the directions for the use of the book, it is hard to see how objections could be raised to it. The committee remained true to the instructions given it by the Assembly of 1903. The second resolution reads as follows: "That in the preparation of these voluntary services the committee be instructed to draw from the Holy

Scriptures and the usage of the Reformed Churches; to avoid those forms which savor of ritualism; to embody sound doctrine in the language of orderly devotion, and to keep ever in mind the end of Presbyterian worship, which is that all the people should join in the service of God as He is revealed in Jesus Christ." It is true in the preface of the Book of Common Worship a statement is made which seems to violate the instructions of the Assembly. "We have searched the Holy Scriptures, the usage of the Reformed Churches, and *the devotional treasures of early Christianity*, for the most noble, clear, and moving expressions of the Spirit of Praise and Prayer." The last clause might be regarded objectionable by the sons of puritans but apparently no one entered a protest against it. It is interesting to the readers of the REVIEW that a similar plan of procedure was adopted by the liturgical committee in the Reformed Church. In the report of the committee to the Synod of Baltimore, 1852, the position was taken that the new liturgy ought not to be shaped simply after modern models, referring only to the Old Palatinate and other Reformed liturgies of the sixteenth century but that the general basis of the work should be "the liturgical worship of the primitive church as far as this can be ascertained from the Holy Scriptures, the oldest ecclesiastical writers, and the Greek and Latin Churches of the third and fourth centuries." It was this broad conception of the legitimate field from which to gather liturgical forms which became a source of bitter controversy in the Reformed Church. To-day the Presbyterians accept a similar basis in the preparation of their liturgy without question.

The church is further safeguarded against ritualism and formalism by numerous statements scattered through the book. We read in the Preface sentences like the following: "Among those Churches of the Lord Jesus Christ which follow the Presbyterian rule and order, Liberty of Worship has been esteemed a most precious privilege and inheritance." "This Book of Common Worship is, therefore, not to be taken

in anywise as a liturgy imposed by authority." "None of the Forms of Service in this Book are intended to be in any sense obligatory." In reading over the Order of Morning Service on the Lord's Day one finds a number of conciliating directions. "If any church so desire the Service may begin with the SENTENCES." "Let the People reverently bow down while the Minister leads them in the INVOCATION, using if he will one of the following Prayers." "The People may say this Confession with the Minister." The Gloria Patri "may be said or sung." "In any or all of these Adorations, etc., the Minister, if he will, may use any of the Prayers given in this Book under the title of Treasury of Prayers." A minister, afflicted with indecision, may have to pass through sore trials before he has made up his mind what he *shall* do after he has read all the "may dos." One feels, also, that Presbyterians might unite in the prayer, "Lord we are not liturgical; yet if Thou canst, make us so." Many things must be read, however, in the light of the committee's report in 1905, in the conclusion of which the following statement was made: "We beg you to remember the extreme difficulty and the delicacy of the task laid upon us; the impossibility of following individual tastes and local customs; the necessity of giving up personal preferences, in order to reach a common ground of unity." Considering these difficulties the work of the committee has been most satisfactorily performed. So far as we can learn the objections on the floor of the General Assembly or in the church papers have not been against the quality of the forms and services offered but against all forms and services to be read from a book. This is a species of puritan intolerance which happily the Presbyterian Church has outgrown, or which it never inherited from its founders. Forms of service were used in most, if not all, of the Reformed or Calvinistic churches of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We need only mention the liturgy of John Calvin, Knox's Book of Common Order, and the Palatinate Liturgy. Prayers were prescribed for the different services of the Church, without, how-

ever, prohibiting free prayer. That is the historic position of the Reformed churches on the question of worship,* and to be truly Reformed is to be free to use liturgical forms or to conduct a service without the use of a book. To limit a congregation to one form of service, whether liturgical or free, is to surrender one of the most precious principles of Protestantism and to lapse into the bondage of Romanism. Whether a congregation should adopt one or another form of service depends on its previous customs and usages, on the dictates of Christian reason, and on the principles of Christian cultus defined in the light of the Scriptures, the experience of Christians in all ages, and the principles of pedagogy and aesthetics.

Forms and services are offered for the following occasions: The Order of Morning Service, The Order of Evening Service, A Brief Order of Worship, The Commandments, The Beatitudes, The Order for the Celebration of the Communion, The Order for the Administration of Baptism to Infants, The Order for the Administration of Baptism to Adults, The Order for the Confirmation of Baptismal Vows, An Order for the Reception of Communicants from Other Churches, The Order for the Solemnization of Marriage, The Order for the Burial of the Dead, The Order for the Licensing of Candidates to Preach the Gospel, The Order for the Ordination of Ministers, The Order for the Installation of a Pastor who has been Previously Ordained, The Order for the Ordination of Ruling Elders, The Order for the Installation of Ruling Elders who have been Previously Ordained, The Order for the Ordination of Deacons, The Order for the Laying of the Corner-Stone of a Church, The Order for the Dedication of a

* "It was only the narrower section of Puritanism which was opposed to prayer-books. This opposition was stronger in Scotland than in England because of historical circumstances. The opposition to liturgies in England was rather on the part of the Independents." American Presbyterianism by Briggs, p. 35. "Those who in later times sought to prescribe *against* the use of written prayers and to impose upon others their view of the exclusion of certain things, went into the teeth of the views of the Westminster divines." *Idem*, p. 37, footnote.

Church, The Treasury of Prayers which includes prayers for Common Worship, Special Seasons and Occasions, and Family Prayers, The Psalter, and The Ancient Hymns and Canticles. The completeness of the work is particularly commendable.

The material for the services is taken from the Bible, the ancient and modern liturgies, and devotional writings of all ages. Prayers are credited to the Liturgy of St. James, St. Thomas Aquinas, the Scottish Church Common Order, the Order of Worship of the Reformed Church in America, etc. Three of the collects in the Evening Service are taken from the Order of Worship, not as the committee reports in 1905, of the Reformed Church in America, but of the Reformed Church in the United States. A place is given in the Morning Service for the Confession of Sin, the Assurance of Pardon, the Creed, the Gloria Patri, and the Lord's Prayer. Responses for the people are called for at several places and the Psalms are to be read responsively. The General Prayer may be read as prescribed in the Treasury of Prayers or offered freely by the minister. No account is taken of the Church Year. Yet a remarkable concession is made in that direction in the provision of Prayers for New Year's Day, Good Friday, Easter Day, Advent, and Christmas. A century ago a Presbyterian judicatory would probably have denounced such an order without debate. The order for the Holy Communion is prepared according to the instructions given in the Westminster Directory for Worship and the Amended Directory for Worship. "Passages from the Confession of Faith, the Larger Catechism, and Knox's Book of Common Order are carefully wrought into the service. The faith of the Reformed Church in regard to the Sacraments is expressed in the language of devotion." In the marriage service the word "obey" is omitted in the promise required of the woman. She is simply asked to pledge her troth to the husband. The Treasury of Prayers contains a valuable selection of Adorations, Thanksgivings, Supplications, Intercessions, and Family Prayers.

They ought to be in the hands of every minister and distributed for use in separate form in the families of the church. The Psalter printed for responsive readings contains selections appropriate for the festivals in the Church Year, and other occasions such as Thanksgiving Days and National Days. The Ancient Hymns and Canticles bring the congregation in touch with the Church universal in all ages and breathe a spirit of catholicity into worship which can only work in the interest of Christian union and fellowship throughout the world.

There are some features, however, which may be justly criticised. The attitude of the worshipper is not a matter of vital importance. The bowing of the head in prayer is an old Presbyterian, or perhaps a Methodist, custom. In the interest of order and dignity in worship we should prefer the standing or kneeling posture. The bowing of the head is neither one nor the other and reminds one of a compromise in favor of the convenience of the worshipper and not in accord with the reverential spirit of worship. Of course the committee was bound in this respect by previous usage, and it would not have been wise to require a change of posture in the new Order of Service. It is somewhat confusing for the congregation to be reminded by an asterisk that the article in the Creed, "He descended into hell," may be read, "He continued in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day." Why not omit it altogether or decide on one form or the other for use? In doctrinal treatises such differences ought to be noted, but not in a form of worship.

A very beautiful prayer for the dedication of the offering is prescribed. But why should we dedicate the offering, which is a regular part of the service, any more than we dedicate the singing, the preaching, and the praying? The service is not strengthened but weakened by such a prayer. It is a violation of liturgical principles and of the conception of the service as a whole, all of which is an offering of thanksgiving and praise.

A liturgy is more than an aesthetic product. Pure taste, literary culture, and the desire for order and harmony in

worship are not sufficient for the making of an order of worship. The genius of the denomination itself must be in harmony with the liturgical spirit. The collection of the choicest prayers, hymns, and responses of the church catholic and the arrangement of them according to a definite plan may not result in a satisfactory service. A liturgy should be of one cast, a single creation, ruled throughout by the presence of a central idea; in this respect like a poem or other work of art. We fail to find this element in the Book of Common Worship. It is chaste, has an excellent literary style, shows a broad Christian spirit, and is true to the doctrines of the church, but it lacks that indefinable something which we may designate as the unity and symmetry of a single creation. Three years are scarcely sufficient for the preparation of a book of forms which will meet all the liturgical requirements. The history of the Presbyterian Church in the United States is not favorable to the preparation of an order of worship. It took at least a generation to prepare the Order of Worship of the Reformed Church in the United States. The latter may be open to criticism on some of its doctrinal tendencies, but as a work of art it is not excelled by any order in this country. We would call attention to the Evening Service and the Service for Holy Communion as models of liturgical form.

It is not an accident that the demand for a book of common worship came soon after the revision of the Confession of Faith. The two movements come from the same source. The revision was the result of a deeper and broader Christian consciousness in the Presbyterian Church. The view-point and the theological conceptions of the present day are so different from those of the past that the Westminster standards no longer express the living faith of the church. There are many indeed who are trying to convince themselves that the revision was not a modification and that the Declaratory Statement is only an explanation of the original confession. No one will attempt to argue with those who have settled upon that conclusion. Argument would be love's labor lost. But

there are doubtless some who appreciate the fact that the spirit of the Declaratory statement is altogether different from the Confession of Faith. It was the only thing that could be done at the time but the hour will come when a new garment must be cut out of new cloth; the new wine must be put into new bottles. The evangelical experience of the twentieth century must have a form of sound words corresponding to it. The revision was an evidence of living and growing faith in the church and an effort to cast off the outgrown elements in the confession.

A true liturgical movement is also an impulse of faith; a new appreciation of the unity, continuity and catholicity of the church; an attempt to set aside sectarianism, bigotry, and provincial intolerance. What revision signified in doctrine, the Book of Forms indicates in cultus. Both are the products of a new consciousness in the church.

A similar movement is traceable in the Established Church of Scotland in the last century. It was led by Norman Macleod, John Tulloch, and Robert Lee. Mrs. Oliphant, in a chapter of Tulloch's Memoir says of it: "For the first time a longing for freer air and an expanded atmosphere came with the quick growth of renewed existence. It awoke in the open, liberal, and dispassionate mind of Principal Tulloch, in one department of thought and life; in the large, fervent, sympathetic nature of Norman Macleod in another; and in the precise and keen intellect of Robert Lee in a third. All of them were roused by one impulse—seized by a longing after a communion more extended than that which was confined within the limits of a scientific system of doctrine and a certain number of centuries. They bethought themselves that the Apostles' Creed was older and wider and simpler than the Westminster Confession; that the laws of God had been revealed before ever the Reformers were thought of, and that prayer and praise had not been invented in the sixteenth century. . . . Their minds had taken a new turn, unprecedented in Scottish ways. A longing for something 'more Catholic, more mag-

nanimous,' as Irving had said in a previous generation, came upon them." Those men, like the American revisionists, were accused of being bent on the destruction of the Faith, of effacing the historic identity of the Presbyterian cultus, and of bringing in the old ways of the "Scarlet Woman." Yet the result has not been harmful. The sixth edition of the Book of Common Order appeared in 1890, issued by the Church Service Society of Scotland. The Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., has been and is now going through the same stage of development as the Scottish Church fifty years ago. The Reformed Church in the United States has passed through a similar controversy affecting not only cultus but doctrine and polity. It has been beneficial both in liberalizing its spirit in reference to doctrine and in awakening its energies in the direction of practical activity.

We, accordingly, welcome the changes in the Church of the Westminster Confession. We believe in the revision and in the spirit of The Book of Common Worship. While the question of church union is discussed by the representatives of the Heidelberg Catechism and of the Westminster Confession, we are convinced that if the latter continued to progress in the decades to come as they have advanced in the past decades, they will be prepared to lay aside the narrow name of "Presbyterian" and join with the Reformed Church under the broader and more historic name of the Reformed Church in America.

G. W. R.

X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

CHRISTENTUM UND KULTUR. A contribution to Christian ethics by Dr. E. W. Mayer, Professor of Theology in Strassburg University. Berlin, Germany, published by Trowitzsch & Son. Pp. 63. In paper covers. M. 1.40.

The importance of this little "brochure" is by no means to be valued by its size. It is very modest in compass and yet it is to be regarded as an important contribution to the literature of Christian Apologetics. The author, professor of theology in Strassburg University, delivered a course of lectures under the auspices of the Central Committee for Domestic Missions at Berlin which became the nucleus of the present work. The purpose is two-fold. First of all, to meet the objection to Christianity made so frequently, that it is hostile to the development of art and science and those interests generally which may be included under the term civilization; and then, secondly, to define the relation in which Christianity really stands to the development of all those forms of activity which pertain to our secular life, including the idea of morality, and righteousness, or justice among men, as represented by the state. The treatment naturally falls into two divisions. First of all, an introduction in which the problem is stated and the relation between Christianity and the development of culture is considered in its historical aspect. After this historical representation the author proceeds to develop with a great deal of power and with keen insight into the essence of Christianity on the one hand and the significance of secular development on the other, the principles on the basis of which we find not only a reconciliation of the two orders of development, but also a relation between them of such a nature that the former is necessary to the perfection of the latter. In the final chapter the author considers the demands of Christian ethics relative to culture in general and brings his argument to a conclusion by showing that after all, love, which is the essence of Christianity, must enter into all the forms of secular development if these are to have their ultimate value for human well-being.

The word "Kultur" as used by the author has a broader meaning than our English word culture. The author defines it as including all those forms of activity which aim directly or indirectly to make the world subject and serviceable to man. These

activities, therefore, include agriculture, technics, industry, commerce, art, and science, with all their products, and all those forms of human society like the family and the state by which such activity is advanced from age to age. The great question now is, what is the attitude of Christian ethics toward these forms of activity which may be summed up under the head of civilization. The charge has been made time and again, especially by Strauss and Haeckel, that Christianity is hostile to culture; and it must be confessed that there are isolated passages of scripture and multitudes of theological opinions which may be quoted in support of such a charge. The author in his careful and critical examination of the attitude of Christianity finds three different tendencies that have prevailed at different times each of which is more or less defective. First, we have the ascetic tendency; secular development, art, science and civilization are morally without value, and the Christian stands aloof as far as possible from the movement of secular development. Secondly, the mediaeval conception; culture has moral value only in so far as it is made directly to subserve the interests or purpose of the Christian church. Thirdly, what the author calls the Lutheran-Protestant view that culture is in and of itself of value, if it is actuated by the right spirit. It has its own problems and service, its own purpose, which contribute to human well-being if properly carried forward. These tendencies, although each has a measure of truth in it, are all more or less defective, and the author proceeds, accordingly, to supplement and strengthen the position of the Protestant church to the effect that the principles of Christianity must of necessity also apply to all those forms of human activity which serve to ameliorate human conditions and minister to human progress and civilization.

Jesus did not lay down any formal ethical rules by which His followers were to be governed in their relation to secular affairs. In fact this relation varies in different ages of the world according to the advancing development of civilization and culture. But He insists first of all upon a disposition or frame of mind which is to control all human relations; and inasmuch as His ethics constitute not a system, but a reigning spirit, He has founded what will apply to all times and places, and will endure forever. As soon, therefore, as Christianity became conscious that it had to prepare, not for the speedy coming of Christ to judge the world, but for an indefinitely long process of secular development continued to remote ages, it was of prime importance that Christians should take part in all those forms of secular activity which alone make possible the intellectual development of man on the one hand, and his moral and religious development on the other. The proper discharge of vocational duties,

it may be said, requires the same form of activity whether a man be a Christian or not. There is a law of right which applies in both cases. But the underlying motive is different. The selfish, egoistic principle may govern in the one case, but for the Christian the underlying motive can only be that of love, the unadulterated desire to promote the welfare of each and all. The author applies this fundamental principle with great power and skill to commerce, trade, and the various forms of human industry, and especially to those spheres of activity which may be either harmful or beneficial, such as art, philosophy and politics. His treatment of the whole subject may be unreservedly recommended for careful study as it cannot fail to throw light on many of the perplexing problems of the present day.

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By George Trumbull Ladd, LL.D., formerly Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. Two volumes. Pp. 616 and 590. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. \$7.00 per set, net.

Dr. Ladd has for many years held high rank as a psychologist and as a philosopher. He is the author of works in these departments which are well known to all students as thorough and exhaustive in their respective spheres. In addition to these lines of study, Dr. Ladd has also devoted a good deal of attention to theology and his excursions into this field have been productive of fruitful results. It goes without saying, therefore, that when he undertakes to write a treatise on the philosophy of religion, he brings to the task not only ability of a high order, but also special qualifications because of previous familiarity with the subjects which underlie and become manifest in man's religious experience and development, which he proposes to examine in the light of modern science and reflective thinking. The subject is of prime importance, and the two volumes produced by the learned author give evidence both of profound study and discriminating insight. Evidently we have here the crowning work of a busy life on a subject in which the author has a keen, personal interest.

It is, of course, impossible in a brief review of so large a treatise, to give even a summary of the author's line of argument that will be at all intelligible and satisfactory. We must content ourselves with a brief outline of the mode of treatment, and an indication of some of the chief points brought forward by the author in his effort to unify the manifold facts of man's religious experience, and give an intelligent account of the various elements which enter into the faith and practices of religion.

In the first volume the subject is introduced by a discussion

of the problem and method to be pursued, of the difficulties in which the subject is involved, and of the standards of religious values. The author says, "The philosophical method as applied to religion aims (1) to discuss what is permanent and universal; (2) to elucidate and defend what has at least a relative rational certitude; (3) as far as possible to harmonize the conclusions from the religious experiences of man with conclusions derived from his other experiences in a systematic and uniting way."

As the forms of religion are so manifold, differing in belief, mode of worship and in their effect upon conduct, it is exceedingly difficult to find a common basis or starting point from which religious development may be supposed to have developed. Attempts have been made to find what was the religion of primitive man, and to show how all other forms of religion have come from that. All such efforts, the author shows, are futile. There is no primitive man for our scientific study; and there is no form of religion that can be called the primitive form. And yet, there must be in every form of religion an irreducible element that enters into all forms, and that constitutes the kernel of every system of religion that has exercised any influence upon the destiny of man. This element the author characterizes as beginning in the form of a "vague and unreflecting spiritism," and in process of time, however various the forms and systems may be, there emerges a higher development and belief in supernatural powers, more and more personal, until we get the highest form in what we may call Christian Theism. The standard of value by which all religions must be ultimately tested, the author says, is their rationality; and by this test their relative rank must be established.

After discussing the nature of religion the author points out that religion is universal. He asserts that notwithstanding the failure of men like Sir John Lubbock and Professor Tylor to discover any signs of religion among certain races of mankind, recent investigations and careful observations have shown that Cicero was right, that there is absolutely no nation or tribe upon the face of the earth that does not have some form of religious faith and practice. After this, he discusses the origin and differentiation of religions and shows how the development proceeds upon lines which are open to the historian and to the psychologist for scientific study. Religion is a fact of human experience. It is as much a matter of psychology as sensation or perception; but it would be irrational to suppose that an interest so central in human life, and so constant a factor of human experience did not have an objective element on which it rests and which becomes an essential part of it in all its phases.

The subject of religion is man and the author proceeds in the

next place to discuss the nature of man as rational and free and as "made in the divine image." He shows the influence of his physical environment and of science, philosophy and religion in his development. He discusses the relation between morality and religion and comes to the conclusion that the highest form of religion must, in the nature of the case, include "a way of salvation." Christianity is the only form of religion which, in the strict sense of the word, can offer such a boon; and the outcome of religious development through the process of salvation is the establishment of the religious community, the Christian church, the Kingdom of Heaven.

In the second volume, the author considers God as the object of religious faith, the relation of God to the world and the destiny of man. Perhaps the most elaborate and painstaking discussions here are, the one on the problem of evil in connection with the attributes of God, and on personal immortality in connection with the inquiry into the future of the race. The result of the whole discussion is a vindication of the rationality of our Christian faith.

This brief outline may suffice to show the richness and importance of the work under review. Dr. Ladd says religion is the "great psychic uplift of the race." If so, it is of the utmost importance that it should be studied critically and philosophically in order that its true value may appear in the light of modern science; and we may safely recommend all earnest students to master this profound work on the subject.

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE MESSAGES OF THE APOCALYPTICAL WRITERS. The Books of Daniel and Revelation and some Uncanonical Apocalypses with Historical Introductions and a free Rendering in Paraphrase. By Frank C. Porter, Ph.D., D.D., Winkley Professor of Biblical Theology in Yale University. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1905. Pages xxii + 367. Price \$1.25 net.

This volume belongs to the series of biblical commentaries or hand-books, entitled, "The Messages of the Bible." A number of volumes on the Old and New Testament books have appeared and others are in course of preparation. The purpose of the series is to popularize for the preacher and teacher the latest results of exegetical and historical scholarship. "Technicalities and unsettled questions will be, as far as possible, ignored. Each volume will be prepared by a leading specialist and will contain such brief introductions as serve to put the reader into intelligent relation to the general theme treated." We doubt whether this work has received the recognition which it deserves and we would cordially commend it to the reader as one of the most illuminating

aids for Bible study that has been published for a decade or more.

Undoubtedly one of the most difficult portions of the Scriptures is the apocalyptic writing. It is found in the canonical and uncanonical scriptures. Daniel and the Book of Revelation belong to the former; the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses, the Secrets of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Ezra, the Apocalypse of Baruch, and the Apocalypse of Enoch, to the latter. Each of the books is expounded in order. No American scholar is better prepared for this difficult task than Dr. Frank Porter. He is a specialist in Biblical Theology and in pre-Christian Jewish literature. Both his thorough scholarship and his literary art are in evidence in this product of his pen.

Hitherto the apocalypses, instead of being revelations, have been considered as veils of the truth. They have been the playground for enthusiasts, fanatics, and mystics. The sober saints have confessed their inability to understand the mysterious imagery and the strange symbols. The historical method, however, enables the commentator to bring order out of confusion and light out of darkness. The seals of the books are broken and their treasures brought to light. In the preface the author says: "To the historical student these apocalypses have become, in their general character and chief message, among the best instead of quite the least understood books of the canon. And their importance has grown with their understanding. Out of the background to which they were relegated they have suddenly been pushed far forward, too far it may be, into the front rank of historical documents. . . . It is chiefly from the apocalypses, canonical and uncanonical, that we are to gain an understanding of the Jewish religion of the time of Christ. It is from these books that we are to get a true conception of the faiths and hopes, the motives and emotions of primitive Christianity. They are to serve as one of our chief helps to an understanding of the Pauline Christology, and even as our principal way of approach to that central and supreme problem of historian and theologian alike, the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus himself." The student cannot well afford to remain ignorant of these writings as now interpreted for they enter into the discussion of most of the problems of the New Testament period. He may not have the necessary preparation for an original study of the apocalypses, but he will find in this volume all that he needs for an appreciation of their contents and their import.

The introduction, covering sixty-four pages, is a concise and elucidating treatment of the questions relating to these writings in general. The topics discussed are: The Apocalyptic Books; their Number and Scope; Their Historical Place and Significance;

The Relation of Apocalyse to Prophecy; Pseudonymous Authorship; The Apocalyptic Vision; The Literary Composition of Apocalypses; Their Messages for their Own Times; Their Messages for Our Time. There is a separate introduction for each book in which the characteristics of the time of composition, the date of authorship, and the history of the book are treated in detail.

The text is not explained verse by verse in the way of exegetical commentaries, nor is it an homiletic exposition. For example the first six chapters of Daniel are treated under the general topic: The Rewards of Fidelity to the Law and of Faith in God. The subordinate topics are: (1) Loyalty to the Ceremonial Law, (2) Dream of Four World Kingdoms and the Kingdom of God, (3) Faith Tried by Fire, (4) The Proud King's Humiliation, (5) God's Judgment Upon a Sacrilegious King, God's Protection of one who Would not Worship a King. These subjects are interpreted in the light of the times when the book was written, which in the case of Daniel the author thinks was in the Maccabean age before 165 B. C. The story of the choice of Jewish youths, by Nebuchadnezzar, for training as "Chaldeans," which occurred about 605 B. C., was used in the age of Antioch Epiphanes to teach certain religious and moral truths. Antiochus demanded the violation of the Jewish laws regarding food, which was equivalent to apostasy from Jewish faith. Such a demand opened the way for the adaptation of an ancient story to the needs of the hour. Through it a message was conveyed to the Jews of the second century before Christ, and secondarily to mankind at large when confronted by circumstances which are the same in principle though different in form. The author seeks to find the original message of the books and then to interpret them for our age. The philological, exegetical, and historical scholarship is kept in the background, yet it shines out of every page on which, however, we have a presentation of principles and concrete applications. This method is followed in the treatment of each book.

Rarely have we read a book so satisfactory as this. It is fresh, interesting, and suggestive from beginning to end. It will enlarge the vision of the preacher. It will simplify mysterious passages in the Bible. It will render practical and useful a portion of literature which has been largely neglected or abused. It brings out the naturalness and reasonableness of the visions and dreams of a people with whom by virtue of our widely different environment we have lost sympathetic touch.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE BIBLE. Edited by James Moffat, D.D. I., The Book of Ecclesiastes. II., The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Pages 101 and 104. New York, 3 and 5 W. 18th St., A. C. Armstrong & Son.

The purpose of these neat little books is defined by the editor in the preface. "The materials for these volumes are of two kinds. On the one hand, I have set down passages of verse and prose in which some text of this book of the Bible has been used or applied in what appears to be a forcible or notable manner. Some of these are drawn from history and biography, others from literature. In the second place, I have admitted passages which develop aptly and freshly not the words but the ideas of a Biblical verse. . . . Sometimes the materials printed here will serve as lighted candles placed beside the text of Scripture, while in other cases I trust it is not too presumptuous to expect that the juxtaposition of text and quotation may help to set in motion the minds of those who have to use the Bible constantly in the work of preaching or teaching throughout the Christian churches."

To illustrate the method in detail we select a verse from Mark's gospel at random. "He departed into a desert place, and there prayed" (1: 35). The text is printed in red type. A quotation from Emerson and another from George Meredith, throwing light on the text, follow. In this way leading verses are selected from each chapter and notable passages from classic prose and poetry, one, two, or three at a time, follow in order for suggestion and illustration. The selections are well chosen and often set the reader thinking along new lines. Books of this class have their value for those who know how to use them. There are minds which are especially open to suggestions and capable of developing an idea when it is once called forth. It is remarkable, also, to observe how the juxtaposition of Scripture passages and selections from great writers will throw new light upon the former and enable us to see phases of truth which were concealed before. For those who are looking for a work of this description, these books are all that can be desired.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.